

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, March 24, 1993

The House met at 12 noon.
Rabbi Seth H. Frisch, Temple Beth El, Portland, ME, offered the following prayer:

The festival of Passover proclaimed in Your Bible, Lord, is drawing near, and it is in the Passover festival meal that the question is asked by our youngest children: Why is this night different from all other nights? Why indeed, Lord?

We open our doors and we say during the festival meal: All who are hungry, let them come and eat. We say this because there are those who in every generation have been hungry, and over the times and the years we have noticed that there are many who hunger, and these times are no different than those times.

Lord, there are those who hunger for bread and those who hunger for freedom, and all too often they go hand in hand. While this does not make these times different from other times, yet we still ask for freedom from the fear of oppression and from the poverty of servitude which so many of Your children know from their own lives all too well.

During the festival of freedom, the Passover proclaimed in Your Torah, Your Bible, we see that we are commanded to eat unleavened bread. We are told that it is the bread of affliction eaten by Your ancestors, our ancestors, in slavery in Egypt. We are told also in the Bible that it is the bread of freedom which was eaten the first night out of slavery, and we ask: What has changed?

It is not the bread that is changed. It is the people who see it and feel it and eat it who have changed, and we notice, Lord, that the bread changes even today, for even our own people, we Americans in this Nation, have known and tasted of the bread of poverty and of the bread of freedom.

But what makes this night different from all other nights and these times different from all other times is that those who hunger for freedom and for bread look to us, this Nation, this leadership, this House, for your help.

So we today, Lord, look to You for Your guidance, and we ask that You answer our prayers and bestow upon our leaders the wisdom, the ability, and the means to lead us in the difficult challenges we must all face in the days and the months ahead. And so these are our prayers of blessing that You have bestowed upon us and that Your servants have always recited, thanking You for Your blessings in the past and asking for Your continued guidance all the days of our lives.

Blessed art Thou, O Lord, our God, sovereign of the universe, who has kept

us in life, sustained us, and enabled us, all of us, to reach this day. Remain with us, teach us, and, dear Lord, guide us.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 252, nays 147, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 89]

YEAS—252

Abercrombie	Conyers	Gejdenson
Ackerman	Cooper	Gephardt
Andrews (ME)	Coppersmith	Geren
Andrews (NJ)	Costello	Gibbons
Andrews (TX)	Cox	Gillmor
Archer	Coyne	Gilman
Bacchus (FL)	Cramer	Glickman
Baerler	Danner	Gonzalez
Barlow	Darden	Gordon
Barrett (WI)	de la Garza	Green
Bateman	Deal	Gunderson
Becerra	DeFazio	Gutierrez
Beilenson	DeLauro	Hall (OH)
Berman	Dellums	Hall (TX)
Bevill	Derrick	Hamburg
Bilbray	Deutsch	Hamilton
Bishop	Dicks	Harman
Blackwell	Dingell	Hastert
Bonior	Dixon	Hastings
Borski	Dooley	Hayes
Boucher	Durbin	Hefner
Brewster	Edwards (CA)	Hilliard
Brooks	Edwards (TX)	Hinchey
Browder	Engel	Hoagland
Brown (FL)	English (AZ)	Hochbrueckner
Brown (OH)	English (OK)	Hoke
Bryant	Eshoo	Holden
Byrne	Evans	Hughes
Cantwell	Fazio	Hutchinson
Cardin	Fields (LA)	Hutto
Chapman	Filner	Hyde
Clayton	Fingerhut	Inglis
Clement	Fish	Inslee
Clyburn	Flake	Jefferson
Coleman	Foglietta	Johnson (GA)
Collins (IL)	Ford (MI)	Johnson (SD)
Collins (MI)	Frank (MA)	Johnson, E.B.
Combest	Frost	Johnston
Condit	Furse	Kanjorski

Kaptur	Montgomery	Scott
Kasich	Moran	Serrano
Kennedy	Murtha	Shepherd
Kennelly	Myers	Slusky
Kildee	Nadler	Skaggs
Kleczka	Natcher	Skelton
Klein	Neal (MA)	Slattery
Klink	Neal (NC)	Slaughter
Kopetski	Oberstar	Smith (IA)
Kreidler	Obey	Smith (NJ)
LaFalce	Oliver	Snowe
Lambert	Ortiz	Spratt
Lancaster	Orton	Stenholm
Lantos	Oxley	Stokes
LaRocco	Pallone	Strickland
Laughlin	Parker	Studds
Lehman	Pastor	Stupak
Levin	Payne (NJ)	Swift
Lewis (GA)	Payne (VA)	Synar
Lipinski	Pelosi	Tanner
Lloyd	Penny	Tejeda
Long	Peterson (FL)	Thornton
Lowey	Peterson (MN)	Thurman
Maloney	Pickett	Torres
Mann	Pombo	Torricelli
Manton	Pomeroy	Towns
Margolies-	Poshard	Traffant
Mezvisky	Price (NC)	Valentine
Markey	Rahall	Velazquez
Martinez	Ravenel	Vento
Matsui	Reed	Visclosky
Mazzoli	Reynolds	Volkmer
McCloskey	Richardson	Washington
McCurdy	Roemer	Waters
McHale	Rose	Watt
McKinney	Rostenkowski	Waxman
McNulty	Roth	Wheat
Meehan	Rowland	Williams
Meek	Roybal-Allard	Wilson
Menendez	Rush	Wise
Miller (CA)	Sabo	Woolsey
Mineta	Sangmeister	Wyden
Minge	Sarpaluis	Wynn
Mink	Sawyer	Yates
Moakley	Schenk	
Mollohan	Schumer	

NAYS—147

Allard	Dickey	Jacobs
Armedy	Dornan	Johnson, Sam
Bachus (AL)	Duncan	Kim
Baker (CA)	Dunn	King
Baker (LA)	Emerson	Kingston
Ballenger	Everett	Klug
Barrett (NE)	Ewing	Knollenberg
Bartlett	Fawell	Kolbe
Barton	Fields (TX)	Kyl
Bentley	Fowler	Lazio
Bereuter	Franks (CT)	Leach
Bilirakis	Franks (NJ)	Levy
Bliley	Gallely	Lewis (CA)
Blute	Gallo	Lightfoot
Boehlert	Gekas	Linder
Boehner	Gilchrest	Livingston
Bonilla	Gingrich	Machtley
Bunning	Goodlatte	Manzullo
Burton	Goodling	McCandless
Buyer	Goss	McCollum
Callahan	Grams	McCrery
Calvert	Greenwood	McDade
Camp	Hancock	McHugh
Canady	Hansen	McInnis
Castle	Hefley	McKeon
Clinger	Herger	McMillan
Coble	Hobson	Meyers
Collins (GA)	Hoekstra	Mica
Crane	Horn	Michel
Crapo	Huffington	Miller (FL)
Cunningham	Hunter	Molinar
DeLay	Inhofe	Moorhead
Diaz-Balart	Istook	Morella

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Murphy
Nussle
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema

Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist

Talent
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

□ 1230

WE NEED SERIOUS REFORM

(Ms. PRYCE of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Congress reminds me of the alcoholic who refused to enter a treatment facility, saying "I can reform myself."

Mr. Speaker, the Congress cannot reform itself. It spends money like the alcoholic drinks whiskey, rationalizing all the way to oblivion. We need to reform our spending habits, and we need to do it now.

Next week, the Democrat majority will pass a conference report on the budget that will include an extension of the debt limit.

The Democrats want to increase our debt limit by almost \$225 billion. And yet they do not believe our debt problems warrant a radical solution like a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

They refuse to give us a vote on this important and, yes, radical reform proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we need a vote on the balanced budget amendment before we vote on raising the debt limit. The American people need to know that the Congress has no intention of seriously reforming its ways.

TIME TO ACT ON THE CLINTON ECONOMIC PLAN

(Mr. DERRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, last week the House shed the shackles of the status quo and rose to the occasion.

Thanks to strong Democratic support the House approved President Clinton's economic package by a comfortable margin.

This week the national spotlight is trained on the Congress. I would urge my colleagues to move the Clinton package forward.

The Clinton plan directs long-range investments in the economy, it makes \$510 billion in deficit reduction, and it puts forth a short-term stimulus package to create a half million jobs.

Without action, the recovery will produce pitifully few jobs.

At this stage in the last seven recessions, the economy has typically recovered 237 percent of the jobs lost. In the current recovery, we have recovered only 29 percent of the jobs lost.

The House-passed Clinton plan will invigorate small businesses through job creation. It will invest in research and development to promote our Nation's competitiveness. Finally, the plan goes to bat for our children by vaccinating them from infectious disease and by boosting the Head Start Program.

The Congress stands on the brink of approving the most comprehensive economic plan we have ever seen. But we must all do our job.

The American people called on the House to back the President's plan. The House has responded to the people's challenge.

Mr. Speaker, this week the Congress should approve the Clinton plan to get the economy rolling and to create jobs.

INCREASING THE DEBT LIMIT

(Mr. EWING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I urge the American people to look closely at President Clinton's budget conference report that we will probably take up next week.

Inside that document is a little gem which will increase our debt limit by hundreds of billions of dollars.

Yes; as the President drones out about his plan to decrease the deficit, his allies on the Hill will be making plans to increase the debt limit.

Mr. Speaker, this is ridiculous. Are we going to increase the debt or decrease the debt?

The only way to know for sure is to pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

I urge the Democratic leadership to allow us to vote on the balanced budget amendment before we even think of increasing the debt limit.

ENCOURAGING THE SENATE TO ACT ON THE STIMULUS PACKAGE

(Ms. DANNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DANNER. Mr. Speaker, last fall the American people cast their ballots for change.

The people elected a leader who had a vision about what America could be, if the determination and resources could be found to initiate change. President Clinton has demonstrated the determination and the resourcefulness to carry out such change and has not disappointed those who called for renewal.

The renewal has begun with our passage of the President's stimulus package. The stimulus legislation will provide 500,000 jobs, without delay, to those unfortunate individuals not currently employed. Renewal continued with our passage of the budget resolution.

The President has kept his promise to the American people and has submitted to Congress his proposals for transforming Government. Last week we, in this body, took action on those proposals and overwhelmingly endorsed his economic stimulus plan and budget.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is pleased to have acted, in con-

NOT VOTING—31

Applegate
Barcia
Brown (CA)
Carr
Clay
Doolittle
Dreier
Ford (TN)
Grandy
Henry
Houghton

Hoyer
Johnson (CT)
Lewis (FL)
McDermott
Mfume
Owens
Pickle
Quillen
Rangel
Royce
Sanders

□ 1227

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MILLER of Florida led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING RABBI SETH H. FRISCH

(Mr. ANDREWS of Maine asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and honored to welcome to the House of Representatives Rabbi Seth H. Frisch, who offered this morning's opening prayer.

Rabbi Frisch was ordained by the Jewish Theological Seminary of America in New York City in 1986. He served for 3 years at the Temple Emmanuel in Newton, MA, before being installed at the Temple Beth El in Portland, ME, in 1989.

Rabbi Frisch is the youngest rabbi ever installed at the Temple Beth El, the largest Jewish congregation north of Boston.

He is also an active member of the community, a strong advocate for civil rights, and a good friend.

I am pleased and honored to welcome Rabbi Frisch to the Nation's Capitol today and thank him on behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives for offering this morning's opening prayer.

cert with the President, to move our Nation forward—to be the positive force for change that Americans asked for last November.

THE DEBT LIMIT AND THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, when we passed that empty shell known as the Clinton budget last week, it did not include an item that should worry the American people.

But under the rules of the House, when we consider the conference report next week, we will also be considering a Democrat proposal to extend the debt limit. The majority party wants to increase the debt limit by hundreds of billions of dollars.

After seeing the pork in the President's spending package, I can see why they want the additional room to maneuver. But, Mr. Speaker, we must ask ourselves if extending the debt limit is in the best interests of the Nation.

We must come to grips with our debt. We shouldn't try to quietly expand it without considering serious options to reduce it. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to give us a vote on one serious option, the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, before we increase our debt limit.

The American people need to know that we are serious about reducing our debt. The Clinton administration has shown only a serious need to increase it so far.

CLINTON ADMINISTRATION RESPONDS POSITIVELY TO RUSSIAN CRISIS

(Mr. GLICKMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration has handled the crisis in Russia with great professionalism, finesse, and credibility. The President's strong support for Boris Yeltsin, and his support for the forces of democracy and reform, and his leadership in encouraging the rest of the world to adopt a similar response has clearly contributed to an international response dedicated to continue the principles of civil liberties and free market economies.

The President clearly knows that America has big stakes in preserving democracy in Russia. A failure of democracy would produce a renewed nuclear threat, a strong and a legitimate push to restore the defense budget to significantly higher levels, thereby increasing our deficit and perhaps hurting economic recovery, and a reduction in American business and economic op-

portunities in Central and Eastern Europe.

What happens in Russia, Bill Clinton knows, will directly affect the lives of all Americans. There are some politicians in Washington, including a few in the other body, who seem to constantly want to publicly second-guess the President's policies, offering gratuitous advice without the benefit of the intelligence and advice only the President gets every day.

Public gratuitous advice during such tenuous times can sometimes be destructive. The President is handling the foreign crisis just fine. I am thankful that his team is in charge.

SPENDAHOLICS IN DENIAL

(Mr. ZIMMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has denied that there is any pork in his spending package.

The Democrats in the House have protested that this package is not pork, but investment.

Mr. Speaker, this is a classic example of spendaholics in denial.

Next week, when we take up the budget resolution conference report, the Democrats will seek to increase the Federal debt limit by hundreds of billions of dollars.

What do the Democrats want to pay for with this debt limit increase? More pork barrel projects: Things like swimming pool renovations, white water canoeing facilities, and rest room repairs.

I urge the Democrats to check themselves into a Spendaholics Anonymous clinic, and pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

URGING CONGRESS NOT TO LET THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC PROGRAM UNRAVEL

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, a sweater retains its shape and form and its effectiveness to ward off the cold only if we leave the threads intact. If we start pulling at the threads, the sweater unravels and becomes a shapeless and formless mass of material.

The same, I think, analogy applies to the President's economic program. It is composed of a series of threads woven together. They make a form and a shape, and that form and shape will be lower inflation rates, it will be higher rates of employment, it will be a greater and a more abundant and healthier economy.

If the threads are pulled and the economic program unravels, as it will, then it becomes shapeless, formless, and totally ineffective to see us through to the next century.

As the President's program goes through the tortuous legislative process, and there will be people tugging at all of its threads, I hope those threads stay intact and I hope the garment stays together. In keeping the garment together, we can make America stronger.

□ 1240

RAISING THE DEBT CEILING AND THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

(Mr. DELAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, anxiety among constituents is rising over ever-increasing Federal spending and the \$4.15 trillion national debt. And next week the Democrats will try to raise the debt ceiling again. Secretary Bentsen wants Congress to raise it by \$225 billion.

There is also a hue and cry throughout the districts we represent for a balanced budget amendment. This issue received a lot of attention in the last election and we now have the opportunity and responsibility to make good on promises made, keep the public trust—and at the same time reduce the national debt.

Yet there are some Members who argue that such an amendment is unnecessary. Such a position is almost comical in the light of President Clinton's recent proposals to increase domestic spending by \$180 billion, and to increase taxes by \$300 billion and increase the debt by \$1 trillion. Mr. Perot recently said that submitting such a spending program to Congress is like getting a friend who's trying to stop drinking a liquor store. The point is they will spend it. They will not use it to pay down the debt. If it takes an amendment to the Constitution to change the spending habits of Congress for the better, I say let's do it.

Mr. Speaker, I propose, that we break with our miserable tradition—that we change—and try balancing the budget just once. Who knows we might like it. If a balanced budget amendment is passed we might just foster the environment necessary for continued economic growth, begin to reduce the national debt, and effectively represent the people who sent us here.

SUPPORT FOR BORIS YELTSIN

(Mr. SARPALIUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SARPALIUS. Mr. Speaker, I first saw him standing tall in a room along with several of my colleagues where he stood there in support of Dr. Landsbergis and the movement in Lith-

uania, Estonia, and Latvia for their push toward democracy. We all watched him stand tall on top of a tank while the whole world watched him stand up for changes in Russia, for democracy and freedom.

He was the first elected president in over a thousand years in their country, and we heard him stand right here at this podium behind us and address this institution and talk about freedom and democracy and reducing nuclear weapons and working together for world peace.

He now stands again fighting for a new constitution for their country, for a balance of powers.

I can recall when we went to President Bush and begged him to recognize the Baltic States and the movements of Boris Yeltsin. We were the second-to-last country in the world to recognize them. It is encouraging to now have a President who stands tall along the side of President Boris Yeltsin.

TERM LIMITS

(Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of reform proposals that are floating around this House and many of those are very good proposals, and I salute them. But there is one reform proposal that guarantees the most sweeping change in true organizational change to this body, and that is term limits, limiting the number of years that Members of Congress can serve here.

Mr. Speaker, this last year we accomplished significant change in this House with 110 new Members of Congress. That is great. But we need to see even greater change in this House, particularly at the chairman and leadership position level.

It is very important, Mr. Speaker, that this bipartisan effort continue, that we have term limits in this House, and that we do that on bipartisan basis. This is not the Democrats' Congress; this is not the Republicans' Congress. This is America's Congress and America's Congress needs fixing with term limits.

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S ECONOMIC PLAN

(Mr. RUSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to encourage full support of President Clinton's economic stimulus package. The President's plan is about putting people back to work. Opponents of the plan have charged that it is more unnecessary spending. Some have even claimed that much of this spending is for nonemergency purposes.

Let me make it plain, in my community, much of the proposed spending constitutes emergency relief. The exhaustion of unemployment benefits, Head Start, WIC, the Emergency Food Assistance Programs, AIDS research, and Pell grants all constitute an emergency in my district. We've been in a Reagan-Bush economic drought for 12 years and it's time for some rain to fall. It is an emergency when nearly 9 million people are unemployed; when every 104 seconds a black teenage girl becomes pregnant; when every 7 minutes a black baby is born to a mother who had late or nonexistent prenatal care; when less than 1 in 2 black children had private health insurance in 1990; and when black infants are more than five times as likely as white infants to die of AIDS. The African-American community has waited 12 long years for these programs to be funded. Twelve years of deprivation and denial, in my book, constitutes an emergency that must be met with all deliberate speed.

For those who are concerned about the level of proposed spending, President Clinton's plan includes 150 specific cuts in domestic programs. Every investments is paid for, dollar for dollar, by spending cuts in existing programs. Investment means putting more policemen on our streets; investing in the Nation's infrastructure; rebuilding roads and bridges and creating information networks. The President's investment package will create 500,000 jobs by the end of 1994.

Opponents to the President's plan argue that the recession is over and the economy is recovering. But the most important indicator—job growth—is stagnant. There are still mass layoffs—companies like Sears, United Airlines, Campbell Soup, and in my own district, Commonwealth Edison.

Do not let the opponents of this plan fool you. This economic recovery is still far behind those of previous recessionary recoveries when it comes to total jobs lost. The suffering that the American people have experienced must be addressed. I urge total support of President Clinton's investment package and start putting America back to work.

DEBT CEILING-BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

(Mr. HUTCHINSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, the idea to which the American people responded in this past election was the idea of change. The freshman class was elected on the promise that we would work for genuine, substantive change. Nothing could be more symptomatic of the business-as-usual thinking than the proposal on which we will vote to

once again raise the debt ceiling—this time for another \$225 billion.

This type of free-spirited spending is like the fellow who slovenly exceeds his credit card limit. Only there is a significant difference. Instead of Congress changing its irresponsible spending habits, it just raises its credit limit.

Instead of raising the debt ceiling, what we really need to do is pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution and restore fiscal responsibility to the institution of Congress.

QUICK APPROVAL OF CLINTON ECONOMIC PLAN URGED

(Ms. CANTWELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. Speaker, the American people have spoken. They want a strong economy that answers the needs of real people. They want an end to gridlock and the status quo. They want real change.

It is a clear message. It deserves a clear and decisive response.

President Clinton responded clearly when he proposed his comprehensive economic plan to reduce the Federal deficit, cut Government spending, and make the crucial long-term investments that are needed to inspire and uplift the American people. Last week, the House responded with swift and decisive approval of the President's plan.

As President Clinton's plan enters the next stage of debate, the American people are waiting for a response. Will we move forward into a new era of fiscal responsibility and economic growth, or remain stuck in the rationalizations of the past? America is waiting for the answer.

I urge the Congress to take the next step and quickly approve the President's economic plan.

THE BUDDY CHECK TWELVE PROGRAM—AN INNOVATIVE APPROACH TO EARLY DETECTION OF CANCER

(Mrs. FOWLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, the buddy check twelve program of Jacksonville has received national recognition for its innovative approach to dealing with breast cancer awareness.

This joint program between Jacksonville's Baptist Medical Center, WTLV Television 12, and AT&T American Transtech, has impacted 124,000 people since its inception 1 year ago.

The program teaches self-examination for breast cancer. This approach has been used to make early detection a useful tool in saving lives.

Early detection can also be credited with reducing health care costs.

Studies have shown that breast cancer treatment, when detected early, costs approximately \$9,000. For advanced stage breast cancer, the costs can reach \$32,000.

I am proud of the commitment that has been shown in Jacksonville, and urge my colleagues to use the buddy check twelve program as a model in their own communities.

Getting back to the basics—people joining together to help each other—is what this country needs. The buddy check twelve program is one example—it should be copied throughout the Nation.

□ 1250

THE CLINTON ECONOMIC PLAN

(Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the investment package proposed by President Clinton. This is an important program that should be passed into law.

The citizens of this country are demanding that their leaders keep their campaign promises to break the gridlock that has crippled our Government for far too long.

The passage of the President's economic plan by this House has shown the American public that we are serious about getting our country moving again. This economic plan must reach the President's desk without any revisions that exclude funding for such vital programs as Head Start, WIC, and children's immunizations.

Not one benefit is gained by preventing a single mother from getting help during her most difficult times. Not one benefit is gained by uneducated and unhealthy children. No one profits from this, most certainly not our economy.

All of us must do our part to see that the President's economic package is passed in its entirety.

INVEST IN AMERICAN CITIES AND STATES, NOT RUSSIA

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, democracy in Russia is great, but not all the Russkies are buying it. And America should not have to buy it by paying for it either. After all, if dollars produced democracy, the Mideast would be our 51st State.

America should push but not shove. In fact, America's cash may become America's curse for both Boris Yeltsin and democracy in Russia.

It is time for Russia to do it the old-fashioned way, for the Russian people

to nurture, defend, and support democracy, not the American taxpayer. If we have any money laying around, we had better start investing in the cities and the States of America while our democracy is still pretty solid.

HUNTINGTON'S GENE DISCOVERY

(Mr. KNOLLENBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the historic discovery made by an international team of renowned scientists who have uncovered what some have called the most coveted treasure in molecular biology—the gene behind the insidious killer—Huntington's disease.

Mr. Speaker, Huntington's disease is a little-known, but very cruel, neurodegenerative illness that usually strikes a person in their 30's or 40's. This disease is progressive as it gradually, and most certainly, destroys both the mind and body. Those diagnosed with Huntington's disease have come to know that they can expect to live out a 10- or 20-year death sentence striking them down in the prime of life.

Mr. Speaker, folksinger Woody Guthrie is one of the best known victims of this illness that is passed from generation to generation.

But today, Mr. Speaker, the 30,000 Americans suffering from Huntington's disease and the 150,000 Americans at risk of contracting this genetic killer are one giant step closer to knowing that someday Huntington's disease will be a thing of the past, as a team of scientists have unmasked the renegade Huntington's gene after 10 years of searching.

Mr. Speaker, all Americans owe a debt of gratitude to the outstanding scientists of the human genome project. They are the dream team of genetic research and they include: Dr. James Gusella of Massachusetts General Hospital; Dr. Hans Lehrach of the Imperial Cancer Research Fund; Dr. David Housman of MIT; Dr. John Wasmuth of the University of California-Irvine; Dr. Peter Harper of the University of Wales; Dr. Nancy Wexler of Hereditary Disease Foundation of Santa Monica, CA; and Dr. Frances Collins of the University of Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, many others were involved in this important and historic research and we salute each of them.

THE NAFTA FORUM

(Mr. NADLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my commitment to ensuring that the North American

Free-Trade Agreement does not compromise the livelihood of millions of American people, the health and safety of workers in all countries, and the health of our environment. President Clinton has articulated a commitment to ensuring that side agreements to the NAFTA adequately address these crucial concerns.

Tomorrow a very important forum will take place which will aid us in further deliberations as to the future of the North American Free-Trade Agreement. Leading experts from the United States, Mexico, and Canada and my colleagues, the gentleman from Missouri and the gentlewoman from Ohio, will come together to discuss the various aspects of this important issue. This forum will no doubt help us to consider more carefully the North American Free-Trade Agreement as it develops in the next coming months. I thank my colleagues for affording us this valuable opportunity.

INCREASED TAXES AND THE AILING AIRLINE INDUSTRY

(Mr. COLLINS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, yesterday this body gave final approval to a commission to study the problems of the ailing airline industry. I am hopeful that that commission will come back with some positive results. But I am reminded of the Aviation Subcommittee hearings that we just recently held where we listened to people who were involved in the airline industry as they voiced their concerns about needed changes in the tax codes, about concerns of the current bankruptcy laws, about allowing foreign carriers to invest in our domestic carriers, and their concern about additional taxation including the energy tax, a tax that supposedly will cost \$140 million for every penny of increase in fuel to the ailing aviation industry.

As I watched those proceedings, I became concerned and frustrated that some of the Members of this body who are promoting that commission are some of the same Members who just last week voted for a budget resolution that was predicated on the largest tax increase in the history of this Nation including the energy tax, the very measure that will be devastating to the airline industry.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot have it both ways. I hope there will be some revisions in thoughts of Members of this body.

INTRODUCTION OF THE FOREIGN AID REPORTING AND REFORM ACT

(Mr. VALENTINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I introduced legislation which will help this Congress and our new President bring another measure of accountability to Government. This bill is being called the Foreign Aid Reporting and Reform Act of 1993.

Last week, we approved a budget which calls on the American people to sacrifice in order to solve our Nation's budget crisis. We are, rightly, beginning to focus our priorities on investment instead of consumption. We cannot justifiably ask for sacrifice unless we are also willing to show some responsibility in our spending proposals.

One budget category which deserves close scrutiny is foreign aid spending. If we were to live and die by public opinion, foreign assistance would no longer be an issue in our budget negotiations. It would long ago have been dispensed with in favor of our domestic priorities.

As popular as that view might be back home, there is an argument for some foreign aid as long as it is in the best interests of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, our world is changing at an astounding pace. Today's maps are vastly different from those of a decade ago. But, our foreign assistance priorities have not kept pace. The Foreign Aid Reporting Reform Act is designed to help us keep in step with domestic and international priorities.

The current crisis in Russia is a perfect example of the need for this type of comprehensive study. Our ability to come to the rescue in an international crisis is limited both by politics and lack of money. By fully researching the current status of foreign assistance programs, including that of the former Soviet Union, we will be better prepared to make the tough choices necessary to avoid the chaos. We will be able to make intelligent choices—to respond, rather than simply react, to an international crisis.

My bill calls on the administration to report to Congress each year on the status of all foreign aid spending. This report would include information on where our foreign aid dollars are going and what goals we are trying to achieve. For the first time, my bill would require the administration to project a termination date when each foreign aid program would end. As with domestic spending, programs which still serve a legitimate purpose can be saved. Those which have served their purpose or which are not achieving their goals can be ended, in favor of more pressing needs and deficit reduction.

Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Aid Reporting Reform Act does not, of its own merit, increase or reduce our foreign aid spending. It will, however, streamline our current information so that we can make informed decisions about how and where our foreign aid dollars are spent. We owe the American people

this additional measure of accountability.

I urge my colleagues to join me and over 30 original cosponsors in supporting the Foreign Aid Reporting Reform Act.

THE NEW SLICKTIONARY

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton continues to give so many new meanings to old words that perhaps we should consider replacing Webster's dictionary with Clinton's slicktionary.

It could contain these words and phrases: "Contributions," once known as "taxes," still means forcibly extracting from taxpayers their hard-earned dollars. "Deficit," normally considered the result of excessive Government spending, is now a justification for massive new taxes and more spending. "Investment" means a four-legged, rotund animal with curly tail, previously known as "pork." Or "spending."

□ 1300

"Patriotism," formerly used to describe loyalty to one's country, now means an obligation to pay the Government more taxes without complaint. "Tax fairness" is now frequently used to justify increased taxes, particularly on the top half of all wage-earners, who are already paying 94 percent of all taxes.

"Spending cuts" now defines not an actual decrease in spending, but rather a smaller increase than threatened.

Despite what President Clinton says, the American people know what these words really mean; they mean tax and spend, again and again and again.

LET US PULL TOGETHER AS A COUNTRY

(Mr. MINGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I think we have heard a litany of voices this morning that are simply trying to gain time to complain. What we need to do is to pull together as a country. We have had 12 years of gridlock and deadlock and whining. What we need to do is look toward the future and see what we can accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, I have worked with the White House over the last week, I have talked to the President's representatives about the energy tax. I am pleased to learn that yesterday the President decided that ethanol, a renewable fuel, clean burning, good for the environment, will not be subject to the energy tax.

I think this is the type of work that we need to engage in. We have a President who has been more receptive to working with Congress than any President in my memory.

We have an opportunity to work together effectively and to put to an end the deadlock and gridlock that have plagued this city for so many years.

AMENDED HOUSE RULE WOULD REQUIRE THREE-FIFTHS VOTE TO RESTRICT GERMANE AMENDMENTS

(Mr. GILCHREST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation that will bring fair and open debate to the floor of the House of Representatives. This legislation is fairly simple. It would amend the rules of the House to require a three-fifths or 60 percent majority vote in order to adopt a rule which restricts consideration of any germane amendment. All amendments would have to be filed with the Rules Committee at least 3 days prior to consideration of the bill.

The intent of this legislation is to require that the majority consult with the minority to bring a rule to the floor. Rules could easily restrict amendments if the leadership of both parties were consulted.

Citizens around the country are calling for congressional reform and accountability of Members to their constituents back home. What better way to represent our constituents than by considering, through open debate on the floor, every aspect of the legislation we pass.

Some limits are necessary in order to keep debate moving on an issue so that we do not become so embroiled in debate that we are unable to move on to other important issues. However, germane amendments are obviously offered for a reason—because the Member is knowledgeable on the issue and feels that what he or she is offering should be considered by the Whole House. Rules, as they are now, have the effect of gagging these Members from offering amendments that are relevant to the legislation being debated.

All Members deserve to be heard and their constituents also have the right to hear their Representative's position on any given issue. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation and show that they support free and open debate on the House floor.

A NEW DIRECTION?

(Mr. BACHUS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, when President Bill Clinton spoke

of a new direction in his State of the Union Address, I assumed he was talking about bringing the deficit down. I was wrong.

Unfortunately, he meant the deficit was going straight up, under his administration.

We saw signs of this last week when we voted for his massive spending package. Next week we will see more signs of Clinton's new direction when the Democrats vote to raise the debt limit by \$225 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I think our deficit should go in a different direction: down.

We must reduce our public debt. That is why we must pass the balanced budget amendment and do it before we raise the debt limit.

The American people need to know where the Congress stands on actual debt reduction. Only a vote on the balanced budget amendment next week will give them that necessary knowledge.

TERM LIMITS' TIME HAS COME

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, a front-page article in the New York Times last week ridiculed those of us seeking to initiate some reforms in Washington. They labeled us goody-goody chic.

It printed wise sayings by veteran Members, quoted beltway insider comments about "nerds" and "reform wonks."

I suggest this article is out of step with America. People demand change. That means some reform here in this House.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I joined with my colleague, BOB INGLIS, the gentleman from South Carolina, and several grassroots organizations in launching a coordinated national effort to implement Federal term limits, which in many ways is the mother of all reform.

More than 22 million Americans have overwhelmingly voted to limit the terms of Congress. A full 36 percent of this body is already bound by term limits.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the leadership of this Congress to stop throwing roadblocks in the way of those of us who believe in a citizen Congress and who respect the wishes of the American people for change.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the majority leadership to help us move Mr. INGLIS' legislation.

NO PORK IN THE STIMULUS PACKAGE? WRONG

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, yesterday President Clinton, in his concluding remarks during his news conference, said there was not any pork in his economic stimulus package, that there were no swimming pools, no movie theaters, no beachfront parking garages, et cetera, et cetera.

I want to tell you, Mr. Clinton, that is a lot of baloney because they are in there. As a matter of fact, on Tuesday, February 23, Hon. Henry G. Cisneros, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, appeared before the Subcommittee on Veterans' Administration, HUD, and Independent Agencies, and he brought with him a list of all the projects that were going to be funded.

If you will look, Mr. President, if you are paying attention, on page 983 you will find Mr. Cisneros' remarks about these projects and about how they were going to create jobs.

Mr. President, don't try to mislead the American people. That bill is laden with pork, waste, fraud. That is not what the American people want; they want that deficit cut and they don't want more taxes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

The Chair would like to remind the Member to address the Chair and not anyone else.

BIG SPENDING—BUSINESS AS USUAL

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, today the House will consider a \$508.5 million reauthorization of the family planning amendments.

This is a \$96.5 million increase and requests a 55.5 percent increase for fiscal year 1993 spending over the current appropriation for the title X program.

I cannot believe that we are continuing to ask the American taxpayer to pay for such huge increases in these programs, day after day, month after month, year after year. This is just ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker, it is business-as-usual around here. It is the same old lip-service that has frustrated the American taxpayer, and gotten us where we are today, over \$4 trillion in the hole.

No matter how one feels on the divisive issue of abortion, this bill should be defeated on fiscal grounds alone.

I am sure this legislation will pass and once again we will prove that all this talk about spending cuts is a charade, a hoax, a cruel joke on the American people.

□ 1310

PRESIDENT CLINTON IS DISARMING AMERICA

(Mr. HUNTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton is disarming America. The world is still a very dangerous place. In the former Soviet Union, in Bosnia, in the Middle East, in North Korea, we see signs of danger, and President Clinton with his \$127 billion in defense cuts is responding with weakness.

Will Rogers once said, "You can always tell when a war is about to come. It is when America starts disarming."

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton is disarming America.

THE TRUE STORY

(Mrs. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, last year Congress acted positively in supporting the American automobile industry by affirming a 25-percent tariff on minivans and sports utility vehicles. Now the President has supported that congressional action by questioning why the Federal Government gave a \$300 million a year freebie to Japan by reducing the tariffs.

The Japanese Government threatened to take this minivan dispute to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT] if the United States Government persisted in labeling the MPV as a truck for tariff purposes, and the van, also. We originally got into this situation of renaming trucks as cars because the Treasury Department overruled Customs on the classification of MPV's and vans. The chart on MPV's shows just what the inconsistencies are. It is a truck with 2 doors, a car if it has 4 doors—and a truck for CAFE purposes. If it is built like a truck—taxed like a truck—exhausts like a truck—then it is a truck. The freebies should stop. The President is right. Buy American.

HOW ABOUT BEFORE THE LAST 12 YEARS?

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, what I wanted to talk about is we have heard so much in the last couple days about the horrible atrocities of the last 12 years, so I went back and I said, "Well, what about before the last 12?"

And because there are so many people who are interested in saying the last 12 were so horrible, here is what we had for the 4 years before the

Reagan Presidency: 1979-80, the worst inflation in the country in 60 years, 3 to 4 percent under Ronald Reagan.

Interest rates, 21 percent, the highest in 120 years, cut in half under Ronald Reagan.

The weekly wage of American earners, down 9 percent on an average. The median family income down 5½ percent, the highest single tax increase in the history of the United States, auto loans 17 percent, fuel costs doubled.

The Misery Index, which the Democrats used to decry President Ford at that time, of course, that is unemployment plus the inflation rate, under President Ford was 13.2 percent. Under Jimmy Carter, the great humanitarian, 21 percent. Under Ronald Reagan, down to 9.2 percent.

Twelve years of misery? I think not. Look at the statistics, 18½ million new jobs created during that period of time.

I regret there is not more time to talk about these years, but I will do so in the future.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 670, FAMILY PLANNING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1993

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 138 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 138

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 670) to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to ensure that pregnant women receiving assistance under title X of the Public Health Service Act are provided with information and counseling regarding their pregnancies, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered as read for amendment under the five-minute rule. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed, may be offered only by the named proponent or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except as specified in the report, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The amendment in the form of a motion to strike specified in the report to be offered by Representative Bartlett of Maryland shall not be in order if the text proposed to be stricken has been rewritten in its entirety by earlier amendment. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to

the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. House Resolution 81 is hereby laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). The gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes of debate time to my New York colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WALKER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, do I understand correctly that during the debate on the rule that we are about to take up there was a discussion in the Rules Committee with regard to this rule and future rules that would come up in which the gentlewoman from New York and her colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina, said fairly clearly in the Rules Committee that they did not believe that the House should ever again be allowed to have an open rule and that we should resolve all these things in committee and that the House floor should be a place that only ratifies action taken by the committees.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid the gentleman from Pennsylvania is wrong again. No; that was not the discussion.

Mr. WALKER. That discussion did not take place and we will not find any committee transcript indicating that kind of discussion?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. There was no discussion in the Rules Committee as to what kind of rules should be put forward in the future.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] may be referring to a comment that I had made at one point that what had happened in the past when the Department of Education was being discussed here on the floor is that the debate went on for a solid month. That is the only remark that was made.

I do not recall the gentleman from South Carolina saying anything about that at all.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I am a little disturbed by the answer that my good friend, and she is my good friend, the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER], has just given, because I just sent upstairs to try to get the transcript of what took place.

I have to tell my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that I was outraged and I said that some of those remarks were absolutely absurd that took place up there, because I was alarmed at what seems to be a pattern now that is taking place.

As a matter of fact, I am pointing out in my remarks here a little bit later that back in 1977 and 1978, about the time that the gentleman and I came here, that we had under Speaker O'Neill a fairly fair system of free and open debate with open rules on this floor.

Eighty-five percent of all the rules that came to the floor came here in an open rule process in which any Member from 435 areas of this country could stand up and offer legitimate, reasonable, germane amendments to any party of the bill.

In the course of the years since 1977 and 1978, this Rules Committee, governed by the King—I call him a King instead of a Speaker—has shut down these rules, so that in the last term of Congress two-thirds of every rule that came on this floor was shut down, was gagged, and Members of this House could not offer amendments on the floor.

I think what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is talking about is a colloquy that I believe the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER DERRICK] had with some of the Members who were testifying in which it was inferred—and I have to say that my good friend, the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER], later engaged in another colloquy which to me inferred that in the future we are not going to have Members have the right to come on this floor under the 5-minute rule and offer germane amendments to any piece of legislation, that in the future it was going to have to go through the normal committee process.

In other words, if you have got 25 Members serving on the Labor committee, only those 25 Members are going to have the right to have amendments considered on this floor or in the Foreign Affairs Committee or in the Ways and Means Committee.

□ 1320

That to me is the most undemocratic statement I have heard since I have been in this Congress, and that is the issue I said was so absurd up there the other day, and that is what we are going to put a stop to in this House because we are not going to let this continue.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object—

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, could we have regular order, please?

Mr. SOLOMON. What did you say? You are trying to shut me off?

Mr. WALKER. Reserving the right to object—

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). The gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] withdraws her unanimous-consent request.

The gentlewoman is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, we will continue this later.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

Can the gentlewoman withdraw her unanimous-consent request without getting unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes, she can, since it has not yet been granted.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. That is what the Parliamentarian just said?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is the ruling of the Chair.

The Chair now recognizes the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 138 is the rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 670, the Family Planning Amendments of 1993.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

No amendment to the bill is to be in order except those amendments printed in the report to accompany the rule. The amendments are to be considered in the order and manner specified in the report. Except as specified in the report, the amendments are not subject to amendment, nor to a demand for a division of the question.

The Bartlett amendment to strike language in the text of the bill shall not be in order if that language has been rewritten in its entirety by the adoption of an earlier amendment.

The rule makes in order all the germane amendments submitted to the Rules Committee except for two; in both cases, those amendments had not been offered at the Energy and Commerce Committee, nor had the issues they raised been discussed there despite their potentially far-reaching effects on title X Programs.

The rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Finally, the rule provides that House Resolution 81, the earlier rule to provide for consideration of H.R. 670, be laid on the table.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in strongly supporting H.R. 670, the Family Planning Amendments Act of 1993, the bill for which the Rules Committee has recommended this rule. While title X of the Public Health

Service Act was first enacted in 1970, its programs have not been reauthorized since 1985. This overdue legislation will ensure the continued availability of a variety of essential family planning programs and activities.

Let me share with you why this legislation is fundamental. Title X provides a diverse array of health care services to 4 million beneficiaries in over 4,000 clinics across the country every year. Its prime focus is family planning services and education. Under the provisions of this bill, clinics will be able to provide accurate and complete information and counseling on a patient's full range of contraception and pregnancy options.

Women who receive these vital services under title X are just as entitled to complete and accurate information about their health care options as are beneficiaries in private health plans. Passage of this bill will guarantee the end of the previous administration's attempts to impose censorship on poor women's medical care options, threatening the health of low-income women and their families.

In addition to reproductive health services and family planning counseling, title X clinics also often provide access for many women to preventive health care services such as screening for breast and cervical cancer, diabetes, and high blood pressure. These comprehensive medical services are cost-effective investments to preserve our Nation's health.

Finally, title X also supports training, education, and research related to family planning, including the training of 14,000 health care providers to provide family planning services at title X clinics.

One thing title X cannot fund is abortion. Let me repeat that. Despite the opponents' attempts to muddy the issue, no funds under this bill can be used for abortion. What this bill allows is that when a patient makes a request, she can receive complete and objective counseling on all pregnancy management options. Furthermore, H.R. 670 mandates that grant recipients which provide abortion services with non-federal funds must comply with State parental notification or consent laws.

The text of the reported bill is exactly the same as the House-passed version of this authorization in the 102d Congress. Regrettably, President Bush chose to veto that bill. Fortunately for the women of our Nation, the current administration supports enactment of this bill and notes that "the provisions in the bill requiring projects to provide complete information regarding pregnancy management are consistent with the President's recent directive to suspend and revoke the gag rule."

I commend Chairman WAXMAN for again bringing to the floor this vital legislation to ensure American women

have access to all relevant medical information when making reproductive choices.

I ask my colleagues to support the rule so that we may proceed with consideration of this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield, for the purpose of debate only, to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think by now most of our new Members are aware that there are actually two kinds of House rules around here. There are the standing rules that we adopted on opening day, presumably to guide our committee and floor deliberations for the next 2 years. Then there are these special rules which are resolutions reported by the Rules Committee to permit important bills to be considered out of order, and to establish the procedures for their debate and amendment.

Mr. Speaker, in the not-too-distant past, most of these special rules allowed for an open amendment process. Back in the 95th Congress, when Tip O'Neill was the Speaker, in 1977 and 1978, for instance, 85 percent of all of these rules allowed any and all Members to offer germane amendments—any one of the 435 Members. But, I say to my colleagues, all that has gradually changed over the years until in the last Congress, fully two-thirds of any rules that came on this floor limited the amendment process on important bills, and so far in this new Congress, eight out of eight rules have been limited, in other words, all of them, 100 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come to rename these special rules King's Rules, because they seem to conform to the rules laid down by the King of Hearts at the trial of the knave in "Alice in Wonderland."

Do any of the Members have grandchildren? I just read this story to my grandchild the other day. I suggest you go back and reread it.

My colleagues will recall that when Alice was called as a witness, the King suddenly pronounced, "Rule Forty-two: All persons more than a mile high to leave the court."

Well, Alice protested that she was not a mile high, and she added, "That's not a regular rule; you invented it just now."

To which the King replied, "It's the oldest rule in the book."

Well, Mr. Speaker, things have gotten curiously and curiously in this House, and today we are operating under the King's Rules, right out of "Alice in Wonderland." We ought to be ashamed of ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, as much as we might protest that this is not a regular rule,

and that the majority has just invented it, we are told that this is the oldest rule in the book: The King makes the rules around here, and they are subject to change at any time. And boy, are they ever.

Today is an example of just how absurd all this has become. Back on February 16, our Rules Committee reported a rule that allowed just one amendment to the family planning bill—an amendment by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY], who is sitting right behind me, requiring parental notification on abortions for minors.

The following day, February 17, the Democrat leadership pulled that rule, just as it was about to be brought up here on the floor, and nothing further was heard of it for more than a month. Yet we did not have anything on the floor for action. We had, I believe, one bill a week.

Then last week the chairman of the Rules Committee announced that he was reopening consideration for a new rule and Members could again file amendments they wished to offer.

□ 1330

Mr. Speaker, even though the Committee on Rules had rejected seven out of eight amendments submitted on the first go around, the Democrat chairman was now inviting Members to offer even more amendments. To me that was a hopeful sign that we would now have an open rule, or at least a modified open rule, making in order all of the amendments that were submitted up there.

But as it turns out, the Democrat majority had not been overcome by a sudden fit of guilt, fairness, or generosity. In point of fact, the Democrat leadership feared that the one amendment that had been made in order might just pass. So to counteract that possibility, they had to reopen the entire amendment process in order to neutralize that one amendment, and that is what this new rule is all about, neutralizing the opposition.

Talk about democracy. Oh, it is true that the Committee on Rules has made in order four other amendments submitted by Republicans. But, just as with the Bliley amendment, in two of those instances they allow a Democrat to trump the Republican amendments with a watered-down second-degree amendment so there will not be a legitimate vote on any Republican amendment. And in one instance they even allow a Democrat to totally preempt a Republican amendment that they made in order with another amendment, so that if that is adopted, it would preclude the Republican from offering it at all.

Mr. Speaker, you talk about cuteness. These are supposed to be representatives of the people of this Nation, not Members being cute.

Mr. Speaker, this new two-step rule process has been a complete sham and a shell game, allowing the Democrat majority to reopen the amendment process so that Democrat-trumped amendments can be offered. We might as well rename this Committee on Rules the trump shuttle. We show our hand first, then the Democrats shuttle back to the Committee on Rules to produce some kind of a trump card that knocks our hand out.

Mr. Speaker, just as when the king said to Alice that rule XLII requires that all persons over a mile high must leave the court, the Democrat leadership is saying that according to their king's rules, anyone with an amendment with a chance of passing will not win, and they will guarantee it.

It is a little like the Queen of Hearts put it at the same trial: First you get the sentence, then you get the verdict.

Here in the king's House you are sentenced to death by the Committee on Rules before the jury of your peers, the full House, can pronounce itself on the merits of your amendment at all.

I will put it another way, Mr. Speaker, and I hope Members back in their offices are listening. Free thinking and free voting Representatives can forget about participating in the legislative process. The rules are automatically rigged against them, unless they are doing the bidding of the Democrat leadership or the Democrat administration.

Well, welcome to the Committee on Rules. Instead of a kangaroo court, we have got a king of the rule court, right out of Malice in Wonderland. No, I am not tongue-tied; Malice in Wonderland.

Mr. Speaker, I was amazed to read in last Sunday's Washington Post that one freshman Democrat was quoted as saying, "First and foremost, we are here to enact a substantive agenda." He goes on to say, "Whether or not we have open or closed rules will not affect the day-to-day lives of ordinary citizens."

Change? Mr. Speaker, I think there is a serious disconnect here on the part of some of the Members, too many of them, perhaps on the relationship between process and policy.

Let me put it bluntly: If you do not fight to be a part of this process, you are not going to have a dime's worth of influence on the policy. It is just that simple.

I did not come here for that, and I hope you did not. If you do not realize that every time you agree to one of these restrictive rules you are not only disenfranchising yourself, but you are disempowering your constituents as well, then you sure have a lot to learn about both procedure and policy.

Mr. Speaker, maybe to some Members that does not make any difference. Maybe they are more comfortable letting their Democrat leadership and Democrat administration make their

decision for them. Maybe they prefer to be spared the pain and the work involved in being a real player around here. But let me caution Members right now: This kind of automatic pilot mentality will not land them safely back in their districts come election time. Mr. Speaker, Members will be held accountable for the decisions made by this Government, regardless of whether they are actually involved in it or not, and it just will not do for them to claim they were just following orders.

Mr. Speaker, if those policies turn out to be wrong and they fail, Members are going to learn real fast about term limits. There are 63 new Democrats over there. Just continue to be yes men. They should continue ignoring why their constituents that sent them here—it was for change. Remember that word? On the day after the election, just 19 months from now, it is right around the corner, they are going to wake up and find their term has been limited to one.

Mr. Speaker, that is right. Half of them will be gone. I have seen it happen year after year for 15 years. And they wonder, "What did I do wrong? I followed my Democrat leadership."

Mr. Speaker, I would appeal to Members on both sides of the aisle, do not stand blindly and idly by while your basic rights and those of your constituents are being stripped away. This is not a partisan matter. This is about a role of the people's branch, and your place in it. If you do not fight for it now, you will soon be out of it. You had better think about that.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I include extraneous material, including the rollcall votes in the Committee on Rules, including the rollcall vote where every Democrat voted party line against my amendment, the Solomon amendment, banning HIV-AIDS infected immigrants from coming into this country.

ROLLCALL VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE ON RULES ON MOTIONS OFFERED TO THE PROPOSED RULE ON THE FAMILY PLANNING AMENDMENTS (H.R. 670)

1. Solomon motion.—For an open rule plus Solomon amendment #9 (see attached summary of amendments) barring aliens with AIDS from permanent immigration. Rejected: 2-7. Yeas: Solomon and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Hall, Wheat and Slaughter.

2. Goss motion.—For an open rule. Rejected: 2-7. Yeas: Solomon and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Hall, Wheat and Slaughter.

3. Solomon motion.—To make in order Dornan amendment #6. Rejected: 2-7. Yeas: Solomon and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Hall, Wheat and Slaughter.

4. Goss motion.—To make in order Smith (NJ) amendment #8. Rejected: 4-5. Yeas: Moakley, Hall, Solomon and Goss. Nays: Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Wheat and Slaughter.

5. Solomon motion.—To make in order Solomon amendment #9. Rejected: 2-8. Yeas: Solomon and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick,

Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Hall, Wheat and Slaughter.

6. Solomon motion.—To make in order Bartlett amendment #1 even if Waxman amendment #20 is adopted (note: the pending rule precludes Bartlett from being offered if Waxman is adopted). Rejected: 2-8. Yeas: Solomon and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Hall, Wheat and Slaughter.

7. Derrick motion.—To report rule as moved. Adopted: 8-2. Yeas: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Hall, Wheat and Slaughter. Nays: Solomon and Goss.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED TO THE RULES COMMITTEE ON H.R. 670, THE FAMILY PLANNING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1993

1. Bartlett.—Strikes language in the bill clarifying that the conscience clause exemption applies to either an individual or a project and, in the case of a provider, that the patient must be referred to a provider that will provide information.

2. Bailey.—Prohibits the provision of Title X grants to a provider unless that provider agrees that it will notify a parent or legal guardian of a minor seeking abortion services, and at least 48 hours have elapsed. Provides the following exceptions: (1) a doctor certifies that the abortion was necessary to prevent the death of the minor and there is insufficient time to provide the notice; (2) the pregnancy results from incest with a parent or the minor has been at risk of sexual abuse, child abuse or child neglect, provided that the physician notifies state authorities of the known or suspected abuse; (3) in cases where the provider complies with a state or local law which requires parental notification or consent and provides for no waivers or a waiver only for one or more of six stated circumstances.

3. DeLay.—Requires that information on pregnancy management options be given only by a counselor who has a professional degree in medicine or osteopathic medicine, nursing, clinical psychology, an allied health profession, or social work.

4. DeLay.—Requires that Title X grants be given to State health and human services agencies rather than directly to the public or nonprofit private entities.

5. Solomon.—Requires the Secretary, in carrying out duties under the Immigration and Nationality Act, to consider infection with AIDS to be a communicable disease of public health significance.

6. Dornan.—Requires a specific means test to establish "low-income family" under Section 1006 of the Public Health Service Act. This would include counseling services on contraception as well as pregnancy management options. Also specifies that, for minors, the determination of income will be made without maintaining confidentiality between the minor and the minor's family.

7. Burton.—Prohibits the provision of Title X grants to providers unless the provider agreed to distribute condoms which meet minimum FDA standards and provides counseling in the use of the condoms.

8. Smith of New Jersey.—Codifies that a Title X project must be kept separate and distinct, financially and physically, from any abortion-related activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO SECOND DEADLINE: MARCH 22, 1993

9. Solomon.—Prohibits the permanent admission into the U.S. of immigrants who are infected with the HIV virus (identical to Senate-passed language on NIH Authorization).

10. Johnson of Texas.—Withdrawn.

11. Baesler.—Withdrawn.

12. Baesler.—Withdrawn.

13. Kolbe.—Withdrawn.

14. Johnson of Texas.—Withdrawn.

15. Waxman.—Second degree amendment to the DeLay amendment. Adds to list of those allowed to provide pregnancy counseling, persons who meet criteria established by the Secretary and persons who are allowed to provide such counseling under State law.

16. Waxman.—Second degree amendment to the Smith (NJ) amendment. Requires that grantees maintain sufficient records to demonstrate that no Federal funds were used to provide abortion services.

17. Waxman.—Second degree amendment to the Bailey amendment. Restates the bill's provisions requiring that grantees abide by State law regarding parental notification for minors seeking abortion services with pri-

vate funds and clarifies that State law is to be used to define the term "minor."

18. Waxman.—Second degree amendment to the Burton amendment. Clarifies that family planning clinics may only give out condoms that meet applicable existing FDA requirements regarding labeling and quality control, and any subsequently developed requirement on prevention of pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases.

19. Waxman.—Second degree amendment to the Dornan amendment. Defines the target population of the family planning program to be individuals at 185% of the official poverty line and those whose economic status might otherwise prevent their participation.

20. Waxman.—Clarifies that referral for pregnancy management options is not required of an individual provider with objections of conscience but that the project receiving funds must make arrangements for such referral.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 95TH-103D CONG.

Congress (years)	Total rules granted ¹	Open rules		Restrictive rules	
		Number	Percent ²	Number	Percent ³
95th (1977-78)	211	179	85	32	15
96th (1979-80)	214	161	75	53	25
97th (1981-82)	120	90	75	30	25
98th (1983-84)	155	105	68	50	32
99th (1985-86)	115	65	57	50	43
100th (1987-88)	123	66	54	57	46
101st (1989-90)	104	47	45	57	55
102d (1991-92)	109	37	34	72	66
103d (1993-94)	8	0	0	8	100

¹ Total rules counted are all order of business resolutions reported from the Rules Committee which provide for the initial consideration of legislation, except rules on appropriations bills which only waive points of order. Original jurisdiction measures reported as privileged are also not counted.

² Open rules are those which permit any Member to offer any germane amendment to a measure so long as it is otherwise in compliance with the rules of the House. The parenthetical percentages are open rules as a percent of total rules granted.

³ Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules, as well as completely closed rules, and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. The parenthetical percentages are restrictive rules as a percent of total rules granted.

Sources: "Rules Committee Calendars & Surveys of Activities," 95th-102d Cong., "Notices of Action Taken," Committee on Rules, 103d Congress, through Mar. 17, 1993.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 103D CONG.

Rule number date reported	Rule type	Bill number and subject	Amendments submitted	Amendments allowed	Disposition of rule and date
H. Res. 58, Feb. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 1: Family and medical leave	30 (D-5, R-25)	3 (D-0, R-3)	PQ. (264-176, A: 259-164, Feb. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 59, Feb. 3, 1993	MC	H.R. 2: Motor voter	9 (D-1, R-8)	1 (D-0, R-1)	PQ. (248-171, A: 249-170, Feb. 4, 1993).
H. Res. 81, Feb. 16, 1993	MC	H.R. 6: Family planning	8 (D-0, R-8)	1 (D-0, R-1)	
H. Res. 103, Feb. 23, 1993	C	H.R. 920: Unemployment compensation	7 (D-2, R-5)	0	PQ. (243-172, A: 237-178, Feb. 24, 1993).
H. Res. 106, Mar. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 20: Hatch Act amendments	9 (D-1, R-8)	3 (D-0, R-3)	PQ. (248-166, A: 249-163, Mar. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 119, Mar. 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 4: NIH Revitalization Act of 1993	13 (D-4, R-9)	8 (D-3, R-5)	PQ. (247-170, A: 248-170, Mar. 10, 1993).
H. Res. 132, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 1335: Emergency supplemental appropriations	37 (D-8, R-29)	1 (not submitted) (D-1, R-0)	
H. Res. 133, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H. Con. Res. 64: Budget resolution	14 (D-2, R-12)	4 (1-D not submitted) (D-2, R-2)	

Note.—Code: C-Closed; MC-Modified closed; MO-Modified open; O-Open; D-Democrat; R-Republican; PQ: Previous question; A-Adopted; F-Failed.

H. RES. 138—PROVIDING FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 670, THE FAMILY PLANNING AMENDMENTS ACT

(An amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. Solomon)

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 670) to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to ensure that pregnant women receiving assistance under title X of the Public Health Service Act are provided with information and counseling re-

garding their pregnancies, and for other purposes, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. After general debate which shall be confined to the bill and which shall not exceed one hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions."

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to strike a blow for democracy by voting no on the previous question. Get some guts over there. I used to do it against my own party. Vote down this gag rule and vote yes on my amendment to keep those immigrants that are infected with HIV virus out of this country. Your constituents will appreciate that.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I presently have no requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], a new

and very viable member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I find it hard to say more articulately or more passionately what the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has just enunciated.

I think our task here is to try and acquaint all the Members and all the audience and the leadership with the problems that we have got with the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, the President invited Republicans to participate in the legislative process and policymaking. But the Democratic leadership on the Hill has contrary ideas. It is using the Rules Committee to block substantive Republican contributions. The Democrat-controlled Rules Committee has implemented a systematic and wholesale denial of Republican amendments—to date in this Congress we have had eight closed or restrictive rules and no open rules. A few Republican amendments actually were allowed today, but they have been thoroughly gutted by a special process involving so-called second-degree amendments to cancel them out.

The President has invited us in but the Democrat majority on the Rules Committee has slammed the door in our face and pulled away the welcome mat. The majority here has apparently determined the best way to end gridlock is to terminate the democratic system. The surviving descendant of gridlock is a growing monster we could call step-lock. The Democrats are not taking any chances. They march in unison—in lock step—to close off sensitive debate, despite their overwhelming majority. It was not enough that the majority leadership strong-armed the Rules Committee to grant a mostly closed rule for this bill 1 month ago, allowing only 1 of 8 amendments filed, allowing for an amendment to ensure that parents are notified when their children seek abortions. The Democrats pulled that bill and directed the Rules Committee to create a series of perfecting amendments that deflect votes on relevant and substantive proposals offered by several Members.

Do not be fooled by the word "perfecting" used to describe the amendments offered by Mr. WAXMAN. Those so-called perfecting amendments do little more than gut the minority amendments. It is a process that pretends to give us a bigger picture—but yanks the magnifying glass away when the time comes to vote. Some legitimate Republican amendments were closed out entirely—like those offered by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Mr. SOLOMON of New York—to address serious concerns about the proper use of public funds and public health. This bill seeks to boost title X funding by 56 percent over current levels in the next 2 years. Just days after

approving the single largest tax hike in history when all Americans are being asked to sacrifice—is it appropriate to implement a 56-percent increase in this program at this time? And how does this issue—which Mr. WAXMAN has described as one of great public health significance—impact the First Lady's Health Care Task Force, known by some as Hillary Health which will not be revealed until early May?

And what about the public health matter of opening our national borders to immigrants known to be infected with the AIDS virus? By refusing to allow clean votes on these very crucial public health questions, the majority is gagging this House. We are talking about explosive medical cost questions that affect each American in a very personal way. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic leadership may have concluded that Republicans do not matter. But Republicans represent Americans, too. This is the people's House and the people have a right to be represented by each of the 435 Members they sent here. Please defeat the previous question and vote down this rule.

□ 1340

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

I rise in strong support of the bill, and in opposition to the Bliley recommitment motion and the other proposed first amendments.

Title X is an important source of low cost, primary health care services for many poor women. It is part of our Nation's health care solution, not part of the problem. The program is also part of the solution to the abortion problem. I support title X as a legitimate part of a comprehensive effort to prevent unintended pregnancies and thus prevent abortions. It is instructive that those most strongly opposed to choice are also those most strongly opposed to effective voluntary family planning.

The gag rule—which the new President lifted recently—is offensive to American values and contrary to sound medical practice. The American people understand that a system of regulatory controls on factual information, controls on medical professionals, and abrogation of the rights of poor women does great damage to the fabric of our democracy. It is good that the gag rule will be permanently reversed by this legislation.

Mr. Bliley's proposal relating to the issue of parental involvement in abortion decisions should not be supported. H.R. 670 has already been drafted to ensure that it does not interfere with State laws on notice and consent. A provision was put in the bill to protect

State parental notice and consent laws and should be left undisturbed.

It is also important to note that the Bliley motion does not contain appropriate provisions for a judicial bypass. The Supreme Court has required such a judicial bypass mechanism in past decisions and the Bliley motion, if adopted, would be an intentional invitation to litigation, and could well be found to violate constitutional standards.

Several other amendments may be offered today. They are all aimed at undermining title X and should be rejected. Mr. DELAY's amendments would have the effect of raising program costs and cutting back services. He would also effectively terminate many of the grantees who are currently doing excellent work under difficult conditions. And Mr. BARTLETT is proposing an amendment that would effectively reimpose the gag rule by allowing facilities that do not counsel or refer on all options to be funded under the program.

These amendments should be rejected and the underlying bill passed.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY], the distinguished ranking subcommittee member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule. It was approximately 1 month ago that the Rules Committee reported out House Resolution 81, which made my amendment on parental notification in order. Under this rule, all Members of the House would have been given the opportunity to vote on parental notification regarding abortions involving minors.

However, the Democratic leadership pulled the title X reauthorization from the floor when it became clear that the leadership was uncertain whether it had the votes to defeat my amendment.

The Democratic leadership sent the bill back to the Rules Committee in order to assure a rule that would give them the outcome they desired. This new rule attempts to provide a flimsy fig leaf of democracy by providing for some additional amendments. However, we all know that the primary goal of this new rule is to allow the Health Subcommittee chairman to offer a second degree amendment that completely guts my amendment.

Members should realize that Congressman WAXMAN's substitute is clearly a sham substitute which barely adds several new meaningless words to the underlying text of H.R. 670. Clearly, its only intention is to prevent a clean vote on my parental notification amendment.

Mr. Speaker, this body is supposed to represent democracy at its finest. Unfortunately, that has been far from the truth in recent days. I urge my colleagues to restore credibility and integrity to more debate process in this Chamber and to reject this bogus rule.

Mr. Speaker, I was at the Committee on Rules and I was present when the discussion took place between the gentlewoman from New York and the gentleman from South Carolina as to whether amendments were considered in committee and whether they should all be considered in committee or not. Indeed, the gentleman from South Carolina asked me if my amendment had been considered in the committee, and I assured him that it had. Whereupon, he remarked that "Then you are clean," and I said, "Well, I hope I am always that way."

So there was a discussion, and I would invite Members to look at the transcript that was taken at the Committee on Rules and to see for themselves what occurred or what did not occur.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. COPPERSMITH].

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of this rule and in favor of H.R. 670, the reauthorization of the Title X Family Planning Program. I have served as a volunteer with a family planning organization that has used title X funds to provide family planning services to low-income families. I also received the old office of a former Member of this House, George Bush, and before he underwent an ultimately unsuccessful political transformation, he was an original cosponsor of the Title X Program.

Mr. Speaker, the Title X Program is cost-effective. In addition to grants to State and local governments, the program uses low-cost nonprofit providers. Every \$1 spent on family planning services saves \$8 to \$10 or more in future costs. The Title X Program improves maternal and child health. The Title X Program strengthens families. From personal experience, I know the program works, and works well, and so does every other Member of this body.

However, for the past decade, reauthorization of this program has been held hostage to politics. Two prior administrations thought it more important to score points than to serve people. The other side last time complained bitterly that the rule allowed too few amendments; now, the minority complains equally bitterly that the rule allows too many amendments. Once again, men on the other side of the aisle are trying to make innocent women and families bear the cost of their political posturing, by linking this program to some totally unrelated and nongermane issues. Prior and identical versions of this bill were thoroughly debated by this House. It's time to stop playing games with peoples' lives, to adopt this rule, and to reauthorize title X.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], one of the real leaders of this House.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I testified and asked the Rules Committee to report an open rule for the consideration of H.R. 670 because the Family Planning Amendments Act of 1993 is an authorization bill and by definition, establishes the basic parameters of the program.

An open rule, it seemed to me, would be more likely to permit the House to work its will.

The Rules Committee instead opted for business as usual—allowing only a few amendments to be in order and has so crafted the rule that it is highly unlikely some important pro-life amendments permitted under the rule will even get a vote.

The rule before us is unfair, belittles the legislative process, and in a word, is a sham.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to offer an amendment designed to mitigate and perhaps even end the occurrence of a blatant conflict of interest—both ethically and financially.

That conflict of interest exists when title X projects also operate as abortion mills. My amendment would simply have required that a title X clinic be kept separate and distinct, financially and physically from the performance of abortions. It was and is a rather modest proposal.

HHS has compiled a list of at least 39 nonhospital title X clinics that are collocated with abortion mills. The fundamental difference between the provision of birth control and the chemical poisoning or dismemberment of babies by abortion should not be blurred, especially when a fee is collected for each baby aborted. Additionally, now that Mr. Clinton has, by Executive order, mandated referrals for abortion as a method of family planning, title X clinics are free to refer mothers for abortion at their own abortion mills. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to understand the consequence of this—more abortions and an obvious conflict of interest.

When you consider that one major title X recipient—Planned Parenthood—performs or refers for over 200,000 abortions per year which means that Planned Parenthood kills 1 million kids every 5 years. The need for physical and financial separation to avoid a conflict of interest is compelling and obvious.

In their September 24, 1982, report, the General Accounting Office [GAO] said that "HHS needs to set forth clear guidance on the scope of abortion restrictions in its title X program regulations and guidelines." The GAO report further addressed the issue of "organizationally separating the title X family

program" from abortion-related activities.

The GAO report cited a Brooklyn, NY, clinic that operated a family planning clinic and an abortion clinic at the same location. They conducted abortion clinic hours from 8:30 a.m. to 10 a.m. 4 days a week and then shifted to family planning and abortion post-operative hours from 10:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. "Both the family planning and abortion clinics are staffed by the same personnel, and the medical director for the family planning program generally performs the abortions for the clinic as well," the GAO reported. Obviously, this type of activity violates the letter and spirit of the title X statute.

My amendment that was not made in order carefully tracked the final rule which HHS published on February 2, 1988. It would have provided for a case-by-case review by the Department of Health and Human Services. It would have exempted large, metropolitan hospitals due to their unique circumstances and broader public purposes. The final rule also provided a great deal of latitude in the Department's dealings with rural health centers.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. WAXMAN proposed a second-degree amendment which was designed to completely gut my language while putting in its place seemingly innocuous language that says the administration and title X recipients are required to follow the law as it relates to abortion by doing some book-keeping. Big deal.

I argued that Mr. WAXMAN ought to be offering his amendment in addition to, but not in place of, my amendment.

But that's not the little game being played here.

Each of Mr. WAXMAN's second-degree amendments are diversionary in nature and constitute a cynical attempt to preclude consideration of Mr. BLILEY's amendment, mine and others.

Question: Why, Mr. Speaker, why. Why are the pro-abortionists so afraid to let our language proceed to the floor unfettered by tricky substitute language. When you think about it, it is really an insult to the character and intelligence of conscientious Members in this body because the pro-abortion lobby seems to think you are unable to understand the shell game being played out here, or they think that you do not care.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed—but after 13 years here, not surprised anymore. Rather than getting discouraged, though, these cheap tricks only make me and others more determined. The bottom line is that the process here is not on the up and up and that goes double on this rule and bill.

Finally, if we all wonder sometimes why so many people in and out of government have lost faith in Congress it is precisely because of these kinds of deceitful tactics.

The time for reform in this duplicitous process has come.

With the power vested in this House, especially in the majority, goes the moral responsibility to be ethical and fair. This rule flunks any standard of fairness by a wide margin. This rule—this process—is an outrage.

□ 1350

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and I want to make several points. I think it is time for common sense, too. I think it is time for common sense in letting women be able to make decisions with a minimum of hubbub about them which Congress has imposed on them, which the Federal Government has imposed on them, which this debate imposes upon them.

Indeed, ultimately it is a decision that each woman is going to have to make. We ought not to make that process more difficult in the family planning authorization language. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the Bliley amendment, and I oppose it for a number of reasons.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, it is my reading of the Bliley amendment that there is an excellent chance that it will wipe out part, if not all, but definitely part of the West Virginia parental notification statute. That is the statute that in our State was fought over and agonized over for a long period of time. It is a statute, for instance, which was one reason that I withheld support from the early Freedom of Choice Act last year, because it did not have adequate protection for a statute such as the West Virginia parental notification statute.

Yet when I read the Bliley amendment, I read that it probably imposes restrictions that our State legislature, in a rural State, has deemed not worthy of imposing.

I am concerned when I see a waiting period of the magnitude of this one, since many women in our State drive 5 or 6 hours to one of the few clinics that performs abortions and can provide that assistance. So I would say that this seems to suggest one of those undue burdens that the Supreme Court spoke about in one of its recent decisions.

I am also concerned with the incest provision, which says yes, that a minor can waive the parental notification provisions if there is incest by the parent or legal guardian. However, what about by an uncle? What about by a brother? What about by someone of that status of relationship, and not just a parent or guardian, equally as destructive in the family setting? I think that the incest provision definitely falls short here.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I oppose the Bliley amendment. I think it does harm. I also believe that these issues are going to be addressed in subsequent legislation, as well.

I also walked on the floor and heard the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] talking very eloquently about his concern about the HIV situation. I think my colleagues ought to know that the situation he is talking about, banning those with HIV, testing HIV positive, from coming into this country, that is not germane to this provision of the bill. This is Title X: Family Planning Reauthorization. It does not deal with HIV and immigration provisions.

Second, if the Members remember, those on the House floor voted only 2 weeks ago to instruct conferees on another bill that this House stood overwhelmingly in opposition to allowing those with the HIV virus to enter this country. I voted for that language, to ban those from entering this country. That is presently being worked out in conference. That is not germane to this bill. It has been acted upon by this House, it will be acted upon in the future, and that should not be used as a smoke screen to diffuse support for this rule.

I urge support of this rule and support of this legislation. Let us get on with it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the deputy whip.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to once again use the chart to demonstrate how much we have gone in the last several Congresses toward adopting Mussolini rules in the House of Representatives. Mussolini rules are those that follow the handbook of Benito Mussolini, who wanted to make the trains run on time but resorted to fascism to do that. Mussolini rules in the House are those that want to make the House run on time but destroy democracy in order to do it.

Let us see here. During the 95th Congress, just a few short years ago, about 85 percent of all the rules were open rules, in other words allowed free and open debate, allowed middle-class America to have their views heard on the House floor.

□ 1400

Guess what? As middle-class America has become more and more disgusted with the Congress, and has found what Congress is doing, undermining everything they believe in, open rules have declined to the point that in this Congress they have plunged to nothing.

Today we have another Mussolini rule on the floor that gives us no chance for open debate whatsoever.

What has happened about closed rules, as middle America has found

that Congress is not doing what they wish, Congress has more and more resorted to closed rules, until we get to this Congress, when every rule brought to the floor is a closed rule.

What does that tell us? It tells us that the American people are being shut out of this body. It tells us that the Democrats' majority can no longer allow the American people to have their say.

I suggested that this was going to become a part of a pattern here in a colloquy a few minutes ago, and I was told that no such thing was said in the Rules Committee about this becoming a pattern. Now I am not allowed to quote from the transcript of the Rules Committee, but I can paraphrase it, and everything that I said was absolutely true in that colloquy between the gentlewoman from New York and the gentleman from South Carolina in which they talked about the fact that the only amendments that should be allowed on the floor under anything other than emergency conditions should be those that come up in the committee.

Well, what does that mean? It means that we are not going to have a chance for Members of Congress representing 565,000 of their constituents to have their opportunity to offer amendments on the floor. That means that middle class America is being shut out of the House floor, and it is being done purposely, and the Rules Committee has every intention of continuing the pattern.

The gentlewoman from New York referred to the fact that there was a long debate over the Department of Education some years ago, and it went on for some days. And what they do not tell you about that debate—what they do not tell you about that debate that she refers to—is the fact that they checked with their former Republican colleague, Mr. Horton, about this, and Mr. Horton was a proponent of the Department of Education. He did not like that long debate, and I will tell Members why. Because when they went into that debate they had a 100-vote margin and they were going to win the thing by 100 votes. After the debate, and after that bill was defined for the American people, they only won by four votes, because the debate did change minds.

The fact is that that is what often takes place. When you allow free debate on the House floor, when middle-class America has their opportunity to be heard on the House floor, every once in a while minds are changed. Every once in a while we move ahead.

The Democrats know that if we are able to expose their legislation and their programs to the light of day that middle-class America will not agree with them, and they will have a chance, we will have a chance of reversing some of that legislation on the floor.

They do not want that to happen, and so the trend is clear. Mussolini rules are winning. More and more of the open rules are being declined and Mussolini rules are going up, so in this Congress Mussolini wins. We have gone from having "Jefferson's Manual" to having "Mussolini's Manual" governing the House of Representatives.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say to my Democrat friends that last week on the floor I called probably 12 or 13 votes, and I received criticism not from Democrats but from Republicans as well because it took so much time, and people wanted to go home.

What is happening is that the Rules Committee is gagging, literally gagging the Republicans to such a degree that we have no alternative but to use what rules are left to fight for our constituents. If you close off debate in the Rules Committee so we cannot propose our amendments, then you are strangling 550,000 to 600,000 people, and that is just not right.

So I want to tell my Democrat friends that regardless of the pressure I get from Republicans or Democrats, I am going to be calling vote after vote after vote after vote. And when you want to go home to see your families on the weekends, when you have an airplane to catch, and when we are calling a vote, just remember, it is not because we want to do it, it is because you are gagging the Republican minority, because you will not allow us to bring our amendments to the floor which our constituents want fully debated.

So remember what we are telling you today, not only the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], and myself, but many others are going to be calling for lots of votes that are going to cause a lot of discomfort for you, and if you want this discomfort to end, then you are going to have to start being fair with the Republican minority.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD], the ranking Republican on the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule.

The Rules Committee met last month and made the Bliley amendment on parental notification in order. Floor debate on H.R. 670 was scheduled for February 16 and 17. Because of the fear that the amendment might actually succeed, the bill was pulled from floor consideration.

To preclude any possibility that the amendment might prevail, the Rules Committee reconvened to develop a new rule to make in order a second degree amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the minority is continually seeking open rules so that any Member can offer amendments, even second degree amendments. Now we are being advised that when the majority crafts a closed rule and subsequently discovers that it does not have the votes, we are just going to go back to Rules and remedy the situation.

I urge my colleagues to send a message that this is not acceptable. Vote "no" on this rule.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I did not personally offer any amendments on this bill to the Rules Committee; nor did I testify. I have offered amendments in the past, however, and I do support several of the amendments which were offered and either rejected, or accepted in a watered-down form. I know all too well the frustration that comes from being effectively silenced by the heavy hand of the Rules Committee.

Having been there, Mr. Speaker, I can say honestly that I am sick and tired of minority efforts to obtain fairness not being taken seriously in this body. The majority seems to think that every time the minority tries to amend a bill, it is being obstructionist.

Does it ever occur to the suspicious majority that perhaps the minority believes—in good faith—that certain amendments are simply better public policy? That some amendments are offered in an attempt to actually improve the legislation? That reasonable minds can and do legitimately disagree on important issues, and that these voices should be heard? Things like keeping abortion separate from family planning, or ensuring that moneys intended for low-income families actually go to low-income families, or a conscience clause?

These are legitimate concerns, and I believe that at least some of them represent the beliefs of a majority, regardless of how Members feel about abortion itself. These are not obstructionist ploys.

Before the majority simply closes its ears and dismisses my complaints and those of my colleagues as whining, why not listen to an objective voice? Last month, Dr. Thomas Mann of the Brookings Institution told the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress that the current practice of the Rules Committee has deteriorated to a "sharp partisan conflict that has brought great disrepute to the House." Great disrepute to the House. Our rules are no longer about moving legislation forward, as they once were. Our rules are about silencing voices of dissent. And yes, this type of rule has, indeed, brought great disrepute to this great House.

In the spirit of discussion, dissent, and tolerance, I will oppose the rule. I urge Members who have a sense of fair play to do the same.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of our time.

Mr. Speaker, President Lincoln in his first Inaugural said, "If by the mere force of numbers a majority should deprive a minority of any clearly written constitutional right, it might, in a moral point of view, justify revolution." And he went on to say, "And certainly would if such a right were a vital one."

Mr. Speaker, during the last election campaign we witnessed the opening round in a political revolution that is taking place in this land, perhaps most evident, I guess, in the adoption of term-limit initiatives in 14 out of 14 States where it appeared on the ballot—14 out of 14. And notwithstanding all of the winds of change rhetoric that is swirling around this Capitol right now, the people still feel that they are not a part of this Government, that they are being shut out. And you need look no further than these gag rules for evidence that they are indeed being denied full representation, a right guaranteed them under the Constitution.

This is not a partisan matter or a mere procedural squabble. We are talking about the denial of basic constitutional rights of Members of Congress. And believe me, the people are becoming more and more aware of just how important these special rules are.

People are listening. People are watching on C-SPAN, and they know what you are doing. They know what you are doing to the minority.

So I would urge my colleagues to reverse this dangerous trend by putting the people back in the people's House, and by putting this House back in the sunshine of freedom and deliberation.

Members, term limitations. Your constituents are watching, and you had better pay attention to that.

I ask Members to vote down the previous question so that I can offer an open rule that will allow us to again offer the amendment which would ban immigrants from coming into this country with the infectious disease of AIDS.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself just a few minutes to close debate.

I think it is very apt that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], opened his debate talking about Alice in Wonderland, because that is exactly what we all feel, that we have fallen down the rabbit hole after we have listened to one of these debates. The truth of the matter is in the Rules Committee, that is being put at fault here, it is not that we do not allow Republican amendments, it is that we do not allow every one of them. The one the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] refers to is obviously not germane to this bill, and as the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] so eloquently pointed out, it is being debated as we speak in another bill that has already passed this House.

The fact is in the last bill that I carried on this floor, the NIH bill, there were eight amendments allowed, five of them Republican.

Mr. SOLOMON. Would my friend yield at that point?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. No; I will not yield. If I may, I would like to close debate.

What we have here today is invective and threats, and shouting about what the American people are wanting.

I will tell Members what they are wanting in my district. They are wanting this Congress to get busy and to do something about the direction of this country, to make sure that their children are educated, their health care is taken care of, that their job is somewhat secure.

But we spend the time here, and as I have said many times, I think what we are doing, the fact is that the veto is lost from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, and this is the next way to create gridlock so that the House will not be able to do any of its work.

We have deliberated long and hard. Every Member who comes to the Rules Committee gets heard. And I will submit that what we do is what we are trying to do which is best for the Rules Committee, for our colleagues, and for the country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and I move the previous question on the resolution.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Pursuant to clause 5(b) of rule XV, the Chair will reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for any recorded vote that may be ordered on adoption of the resolution, without intervening business.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 252, nays 164, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 90]

YEAS—252

Abercrombie	Bevill	Byrne
Ackerman	Bilbray	Cantwell
Andrews (ME)	Bishop	Cardin
Andrews (NJ)	Blackwell	Carr
Andrews (TX)	Bonior	Chapman
Applegate	Borski	Clay
Bacchus (FL)	Boucher	Clayton
Baessler	Brewster	Clement
Barcia	Brooks	Clyburn
Barlow	Browder	Coleman
Barrett (WI)	Brown (CA)	Collins (IL)
Becerra	Brown (FL)	Collins (MI)
Beilenson	Brown (OH)	Condit
Berman	Bryant	Conyers

Cooper	Kildee	Price (NC)
Coppersmith	Kleczka	Rahall
Costello	Klein	Rangel
Coyne	Klink	Reed
Cramer	Kopetski	Reynolds
Danner	Kreidler	Richardson
Darden	LaFalce	Roemer
de la Garza	Lambert	Rose
Deal	Lancaster	Rostenkowski
DeFazio	Lantos	Roukema
DeLauro	LaRocco	Rowland
Dellums	Laughlin	Roybal-Allard
Derrick	Lehman	Rush
Deutsch	Levin	Sabo
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Sanders
Dingell	Lipinski	Sangmeister
Dixon	Lloyd	Sarpallus
Dooley	Long	Sawyer
Durbin	Lowey	Schenk
Edwards (CA)	Maloney	Schroeder
Edwards (TX)	Mann	Schumer
Engel	Manton	Scott
English (AZ)	Margolies-	Serrano
English (OK)	Mezvinsky	Shays
Eshoo	Markey	Shepherd
Evans	Martinez	Sisisky
Fazio	Matsui	Skaggs
Fields (LA)	Mazzoli	Skelton
Filner	McCloskey	Slattery
Fingerhut	McCurdy	Slaughter
Flake	McHale	Smith (IA)
Foglietta	McKinney	Spratt
Ford (MI)	McNulty	Stark
Frank (MA)	Meehan	Stenholm
Frost	Meek	Stokes
Furse	Menendez	Strickland
Gejdenson	Meyers	Studds
Gephardt	Mfume	Stupak
Geren	Miller (CA)	Swift
Gibbons	Mineta	Synar
Glickman	Minge	Tanner
Gonzalez	Mink	Tauzin
Gordon	Moakley	Taylor (MS)
Green	Molohan	Tejeda
Gutierrez	Montgomery	Thornton
Hall (OH)	Moran	Thurman
Hall (TX)	Morella	Torricelli
Hamburg	Murphy	Towns
Hamilton	Murtha	Trafigant
Harman	Nadler	Tucker
Hastings	Natcher	Unsoeld
Hayes	Neal (MA)	Valentine
Hefner	Neal (NC)	Velazquez
Hilliard	Oberstar	Vento
Hinche	Obey	Visclosky
Hoagland	Oliver	Volkmer
Hochbrueckner	Ortiz	Washington
Holden	Orton	Waters
Hoyer	Owens	Watt
Hughes	Pallone	Waxman
Hutto	Parker	Wheat
Inslee	Pastor	Whitten
Jefferson	Payne (NJ)	Williams
Johnson (GA)	Payne (VA)	Wilson
Johnson (SD)	Pelosi	Wise
Johnson, E.B.	Penny	Woolsey
Johnston	Peterson (FL)	Wyden
Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)	Wynn
Kaptur	Pickett	Yates
Kennedy	Pomeroy	
Kennelly	Poshard	

NAYS—164

Allard	Callahan	Fawell
Archer	Calvert	Fields (TX)
Armey	Camp	Fish
Bacchus (AL)	Canady	Fowler
Baker (CA)	Castle	Franks (CT)
Baker (LA)	Clinger	Franks (NJ)
Ballenger	Coble	Gallely
Barrett (NE)	Collins (GA)	Gallo
Bartlett	Combest	Gekas
Barton	Cox	Gilchrest
Bateman	Crane	Gillmor
Bentley	Crapo	Gilman
Bereuter	Cunningham	Gingrich
Bilirakis	DeLay	Goodlatte
Bliley	Diaz-Balart	Goodling
Blute	Dickey	Goss
Boehliert	Dorman	Grams
Boehner	Duncan	Grandy
Bonilla	Dunn	Greenwood
Bunning	Emerson	Gunderson
Burton	Everett	Hancock
Buyer	Ewing	Hastert

Hefley	Manzullo	Royce
Herger	McCandless	Santorum
Hobson	McCollum	Saxton
Hoekstra	McCrery	Schaefer
Hoke	McDade	Schiff
Horn	McHugh	Sensenbrenner
Houghton	McInnis	Shuster
Huffington	McKeon	Skeen
Hunter	McMillan	Smith (MI)
Hutchinson	Mica	Smith (NJ)
Hyde	Michel	Smith (OR)
Inglis	Miller (FL)	Smith (TX)
Inhofe	Molinar	Snowe
Istook	Moorhead	Solomon
Jacobs	Myers	Spence
Johnson (CT)	Nussle	Stearns
Johnson, Sam	Oxley	Stump
Kasich	Packard	Sundquist
Kim	Paxon	Talent
King	Petri	Taylor (NC)
Kingston	Pombo	Thomas (CA)
Klug	Porter	Thomas (WY)
Knollenberg	Pryce (OH)	Torkildsen
Kolbe	Quinn	Upton
Kyl	Ramstad	Vucanovich
Lazio	Ravenel	Walker
Leach	Regula	Walsh
Levy	Ridge	Weldon
Lewis (CA)	Roberts	Wolf
Lightfoot	Rogers	Young (AK)
Linder	Rohrabacher	Young (FL)
Livingston	Ros-Lehtinen	Zimmer
Machtley	Roth	

NOT VOTING—14

Doolittle	Lewis (FL)	Shaw
Dreier	McDermott	Swett
Ford (TN)	Pickle	Torres
Hansen	Quillen	Zeliff
Henry	Sharp	

□ 1429

Mr. BLACKWELL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 247, nays 169, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 91]

YEAS—247

Abercrombie	Brown (CA)	de la Garza
Ackerman	Brown (FL)	Deal
Andrews (ME)	Brown (OH)	DeFazio
Andrews (NJ)	Bryant	DeLauro
Andrews (TX)	Byrne	Dellums
Applegate	Cantwell	Derrick
Bacchus (FL)	Cardin	Deutsch
Baessler	Carr	Dicks
Barcia	Chapman	Dingell
Barlow	Clay	Dixon
Barrett (WI)	Clayton	Dooley
Becerra	Clement	Durbin
Beilenson	Clyburn	Edwards (CA)
Berman	Coleman	Edwards (TX)
	Collins (IL)	Engel
	Collins (MI)	English (OK)
	Condit	Eshoo
	Conyers	Evans
	Cooper	Fazio
	Bonior	Fields (LA)
	Costello	Filner
	Coyne	Fingerhut
	Cramer	Flake
	Danner	Foglietta
	Darden	Ford (MI)

Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kiecicka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley

Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-
Mezvisinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski

Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpaluis
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Snowe
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tejeda
Thornton
Thurman
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NAYS—169

Allard
Archer
Army
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay

Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dornan
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke

Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Ingalls
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCreary
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon

McMillan
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinar
Mollohan
Moorhead
Murphy
Myers
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Ravenel

Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Stearns

Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—14

Doolittle
Dreier
English (AZ)
Ford (TN)
Henry

Johnson, E.B.
Lewis (FL)
Pickle
Quillen
Sharp

Shaw
Swett
Torres
Zeliff

□ 1439

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Pickle for, with Mr. Doolittle against.
Mr. Torres for, with Mr. Lewis against.

Ms. English for, with Mr. Quillen against.

Mr. TAUZIN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

Mr. WALKER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the House passed House Resolution 138.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I have not objected. I am reserving the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has a privileged motion which she can offer at this point.

□ 1440

MOTION OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the House agreed to House Resolution 138.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). For what purpose does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] rise?

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MOAKLEY

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 252, noes 165, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 92]

AYES—252

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Becerra
Bellenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez

Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kiecicka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-
Mezvisinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar

Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpaluis
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Snowe
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tejeda
Thornton
Thurman
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOES—165

Allard	Goodlatte	Moorhead
Archer	Goodling	Myers
Arney	Goss	Nussle
Bachus (AL)	Grams	Oxley
Baker (CA)	Grandy	Packard
Baker (LA)	Greenwood	Paxon
Balenger	Gunderson	Petri
Barrett (NE)	Hall (TX)	Pombo
Bartlett	Hancock	Porter
Barton	Hansen	Pryce (OH)
Bateman	Hastert	Quinn
Bentley	Hefley	Ramstad
Bereuter	Herger	Ravenel
Bilirakis	Hobson	Regula
Bliley	Hoekstra	Ridge
Blute	Hoke	Roberts
Boehner	Horn	Rogers
Bonilla	Houghton	Rohrabacher
Bunning	Huffington	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton	Hunter	Roth
Buyer	Hutchinson	Royce
Callahan	Hutto	Santorum
Calvert	Hyde	Saxton
Camp	Inglis	Schaefer
Canady	Inhofe	Schiff
Castle	Istook	Sensenbrenner
Clinger	Johnson (CT)	Shaw
Coble	Johnson, Sam	Shuster
Collins (GA)	Kasich	Skeen
Combest	Kim	Smith (MI)
Cox	King	Smith (NJ)
Crane	Kingston	Smith (OR)
Crapo	Klug	Smith (TX)
Cunningham	Knollenberg	Solomon
DeLay	Kolbe	Spence
Diaz-Balart	Kyl	Stearns
Dickey	Lazio	Stenholm
Dornan	Levy	Stump
Duncan	Lewis (CA)	Sundquist
Dunn	Lightfoot	Talent
Emerson	Linder	Tauzin
Everett	Livingston	Taylor (MS)
Ewing	Manzullo	Taylor (NC)
Fawell	McCandless	Thomas (CA)
Fields (TX)	McCollum	Thomas (WY)
Fish	McCrery	Torkildsen
Fowler	McDade	Upton
Franks (CT)	McHugh	Vucanovich
Franks (NJ)	McInnis	Walker
Galleghy	McKeon	Walsh
Gallo	McMillan	Weldon
Gekas	Mica	Wolf
Gilchrest	Michel	Young (AK)
Gillmor	Miller (FL)	Young (FL)
Gingrich	Molinari	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—13

Barrett (WI)	Lewis (FL)	Swett
Doolittle	Pickle	Torres
Dreier	Quillen	Zeliff
Ford (TN)	Sharp	
Henry	Skaggs	

□ 1457

So the motion to table was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana moves that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 32, nays 374, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 93]

YEAS—32

Allard	Emerson	Mica
Arney	Fields (TX)	Moorhead
Baker (CA)	Franks (CT)	Paxon
Bartlett	Hancock	Rohrabacher
Burton	Hefley	Santorum
Castle	Hoke	Schaefer
Cox	Hunter	Smith (NJ)
Crane	Kingston	Stump
DeLay	Livingston	Sundquist
Dornan	McInnis	Taylor (NC)
Duncan	McKeon	

NAYS—374

Abercrombie	Crapo	Hefner
Ackerman	Cunningham	Herger
Andrews (ME)	Danner	Hilliard
Andrews (NJ)	Darden	Hinchey
Andrews (TX)	Deal	Hoagland
Applegate	DeFazio	Hobson
Archer	DeLauro	Hochbrueckner
Bacchus (FL)	Derrick	Hoekstra
Bachus (AL)	Deutsch	Holden
Baessler	Diaz-Balart	Horn
Baker (LA)	Dickey	Houghton
Balenger	Dicks	Hoyer
Barcia	Dixon	Huffington
Barlow	Dooley	Hughes
Barrett (NE)	Dunn	Hutchinson
Barrett (WI)	Durbin	Hutto
Barton	Edwards (TX)	Hyde
Bateman	Engel	Inglis
Becerra	English (AZ)	Inhofe
Beilenson	English (OK)	Inslee
Bentley	Eshoo	Istook
Bereuter	Evans	Jacobs
Bevill	Everett	Jefferson
Bilbray	Ewing	Johnson (CT)
Bilirakis	Fawell	Johnson (GA)
Bishop	Fazio	Johnson (SD)
Blackwell	Fields (LA)	Johnson, E.B.
Bliley	Fliner	Johnston
Blute	Fingerhut	Kanjorski
Boehler	Fish	Kaptur
Boehner	Flake	Kasich
Bonilla	Foglietta	Kennedy
Bonior	Ford (MI)	Kennelly
Borski	Fowler	Kildee
Boucher	Frank (MA)	Kim
Brewster	Franks (NJ)	King
Brooks	Frost	Kleczka
Browder	Furse	Klein
Brown (FL)	Galleghy	Klink
Brown (OH)	Gallo	Klug
Bryant	Gejdenson	Knollenberg
Bunning	Gekas	Kolbe
Buyer	Gephardt	Kopetski
Byrne	Geran	Kreidler
Callahan	Gibbons	Kyl
Calvert	Gilchrest	Lambert
Camp	Gillmor	Lancaster
Canady	Gilman	Lantos
Cantwell	Gingrich	LaRocco
Cardin	Glickman	Laughlin
Carr	Gonzalez	Lazio
Chapman	Goodlatte	Leach
Clay	Goodling	Lehman
Clayton	Gordon	Levin
Clement	Goss	Levy
Clinger	Grams	Lewis (CA)
Clyburn	Grandy	Lewis (GA)
Coble	Green	Lightfoot
Coleman	Greenwood	Linder
Collins (GA)	Gunderson	Lipinski
Collins (IL)	Gutierrez	Lloyd
Collins (MI)	Hall (OH)	Long
Combest	Hall (TX)	Lowey
Condit	Hamburg	Machtley
Conyers	Hamilton	Maloney
Cooper	Hansen	Mann
Coppersmith	Harman	Manton
Costello	Hastert	Manzullo
Coyne	Hastings	Margolies-
Cramer	Hayes	Mezvinsky

Markey	Peterson (MN)	Smith (OR)
Matsui	Petri	Smith (TX)
Mazzoli	Pickett	Snowe
McCandless	Pombo	Solomon
McCloskey	Pomeroy	Spence
McCollum	Porter	Spratt
McCrery	Poshard	Stark
McCurdy	Price (NC)	Stearns
McDade	Pryce (OH)	Stenholm
McDermott	Quinn	Stokes
McHale	Rahall	Strickland
McHugh	Ramstad	Studds
McKinney	Ravenel	Stupak
McMillan	Reed	Swift
McNulty	Regula	Synar
Meehan	Reynolds	Talent
Meek	Richardson	Tanner
Menendez	Ridge	Tauzin
MFume	Roberts	Taylor (MS)
Michel	Roemer	Thomas (CA)
Miller (CA)	Rogers	Thomas (WY)
Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Thornton
Mineta	Rose	Thurman
Minge	Rostenkowski	Torkildsen
Mink	Roth	Torres
Moakley	Roukema	Torricelli
Molinari	Rowland	Towns
Mollohan	Roybal-Allard	Trafficant
Montgomery	Royce	Tucker
Moran	Rush	Unsold
Morella	Sabo	Upton
Murphy	Sanders	Valentine
Murtha	Sangmeister	Velazquez
Myers	Sarpalio	Vento
Nadler	Sawyer	Visclosky
Natcher	Saxton	Volkmer
Neal (MA)	Schenk	Vucanovich
Neal (NC)	Schiff	Walker
Nussle	Schroeder	Walsh
Oberstar	Schumer	Waters
Obey	Scott	Watt
Oliver	Sensenbrenner	Waxman
Ortiz	Serrano	Weldon
Orton	Shaw	Wheat
Owens	Shays	Whitten
Oxley	Shepherd	Wilson
Packard	Shuster	Wise
Pallone	Siskis	Wolf
Parker	Skaggs	Woolsey
Pastor	Skeen	Wyden
Payne (NJ)	Skelton	Wynn
Payne (VA)	Slattery	Yates
Pelosi	Slaughter	Young (AK)
Penny	Smith (IA)	Young (FL)
Peterson (FL)	Smith (MI)	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—24

Berman	Ford (TN)	Quillen
Brown (CA)	Henry	Rangel
de la Garza	Johnson, Sam	Sharp
Dellums	LaFalce	Swett
Dingell	Lewis (FL)	Tejeda
Doolittle	Martinez	Washington
Dreier	Meyers	Williams
Edwards (CA)	Pickle	Zeliff

□ 1517

Mr. HILLIARD changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for rollcall votes numbered 90 through 93. Had I been present for these rollcalls I would have voted "No" in each instance.

During these votes I was meeting with officials at the Environmental Protection Agency to discuss the findings of my citizens task force on Superfund reform.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TEJEDA. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 93 on motion to ad-

journal I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "No."

FAMILY PLANNING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS). Pursuant to House Resolution 138 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 670.

□ 1517

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 670) to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to ensure that pregnant women receiving assistance under title X of the Public Health Service Act are provided with information and counseling regarding their pregnancies, and for other purposes, with Ms. SLAUGHTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, H.R. 670 is a bill to reauthorize the Federal family planning program, to overturn the gag rule on health professionals in family planning clinics, and to require that these clinics comply with State law that is in force regarding parental notification or consent for minors seeking an abortion.

ON REAUTHORIZATION

The Federal family planning program is a key element in the Nation's effort to improve maternal and child health, lower infant mortality, and lower the rates of unwanted pregnancy and abortion in the United States. Over the years, expert review and medical research have always arrived at the same common sense conclusion: The best solution to unwanted pregnancy is to prevent the pregnancy.

Unfortunately, this program has been held hostage in the abortion debate for too long. The program has been proposed for repeals, block grants, freezes, and restrictions. It has not been reauthorized since 1985 and has not had significant funding increases since its last authorization.

The tragic result is that routine contraception services have been limited over the last decade, and that has

meant unwanted pregnancy and, in turn, unnecessarily high rates of both low-birth-weight babies and abortions.

With this legislation, I hope that we can expand these services and move beyond the abortion debate to the health debate. The continued use of the family planning program as a pawn in this debate is self-defeating, leaving poor women with fewer and fewer ways to prevent pregnancy.

ON THE GAG RULE

We should also move to ensure that poor women are able to get the best medical advice of the health professionals that provide them services. The Bush administration proposed regulations to limit the ability of doctors and nurses to counsel and refer patients or even to answer point-blank questions with truthful answers. This regulation—which is known as the gag rule—is bad medicine, bad law, and bad precedent. And although President Clinton has now suspended the implementation of this regulation, it is important that we move forward with legislation to guarantee the provision of accurate and truthful information to all title X patients.

H.R. 670 would permanently reverse the gag rule and replace it with a codification of the guidelines that were issued by the Reagan administration on how a family planning clinic should deal with a pregnant woman. This is a simple approach: If a patient requests information on pregnancy options, she should be given that information. It should be nondirective, it should be complete, and it should be true.

This has been the practice of the program since its inception. It was formalized by the Reagan administration. It is supported by all health provider groups, including the American Medical Association and the American Nurses Association. It should continue to be the policy of the program.

ON PARENTAL NOTIFICATION

Finally, this bill contains an amendment to require that clinics receiving funds under this program comply with any State law in force that provides for parental notification or consent for minors seeking abortions.

The first thing that I want to make explicit is that title X funds cannot be used to perform abortions. Nothing in this bill changes that policy. This amendment affects only title X clinics that provide abortions with totally separate, non-Federal funds.

The amendment requires that these clinics comply with State law that is in force on parental notification and consent. The committee took this approach because of the widely varying provisions of State parental involvement law. Some States require it, some States do not. Some States make exceptions for medical emergencies. Some States allow notification to grandparents. Some States allow counseling by clergy instead.

Rather than superceding this variety of laws, the committee chose to recognize these laws in a States' rights manner. It would be inappropriate to override State laws in this extremely complex area through a small grants program.

CONCLUSION

In closing, I would simply reemphasize that the Federal family planning program is our best hope to achieve many maternal and child health goals. To reduce unwanted pregnancy we should make family planning widely available. To lower abortion rates we should give women the ability to prevent pregnancy. Finally planning is not the problem. It is the solution. I urge Members to support H.R. 670.

□ 1520

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I am unable to support H.R. 670. I simply cannot reconcile the provisions of H.R. 670 with my view that the purpose of the family planning program is to provide low-income women with the health care services necessary to plan their families.

It must be remembered that the authorizing statute for the family planning program includes a prohibition on the use of title X funds in programs where abortion is a method of family planning. H.R. 670 conflicts with the underlying intent of this provision. It does not make sense that a program originally intended to reduce abortion should provide counseling and refer women for abortions. I do not believe that abortion counseling and referrals have any place in this program.

Since the very beginning of the program it has been HHS policy to treat abortion differently from other services. Referral is a very important and integral part of title X because it is a limited pre-pregnancy program.

Under H.R. 670, however, title X projects will be required to treat abortion referrals on an equal basis with all other types of referrals. In no way does the bill merely maintain the status quo in regards to counseling and referral.

H.R. 670 should also be opposed because it is a budget buster of the first magnitude.

The total authorization for fiscal year 1994 is a 37.7-percent increase over the fiscal year 1993 appropriation and is 16.7 percent higher than what came out of conference just last year for 1994. As one of the first programs to be reauthorized this year, it is the wrong message to send to the American people. What happened to our commitment to control spending and reduce the deficit? Does this reflect the type of spending requests we are going to grant in this new Congress? If you give title X a 37 percent increase, how are you going

to say no to all the advocates of all the other programs?

In sum, Madam Chairman, I am unable to support this bill and I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing it.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAMBURG].

Mr. HAMBURG. Madam Chairman, I rise to speak in strong support of reauthorization of title X of the Public Health Service Act as set forth in H.R. 670 without amendment.

President Clinton has ordered lifting of the gag rule. For the first time in nearly 5 years, this body can, without the threat of veto, authorize and appropriate resources to provide a full range of information to women about pregnancy options. For the first time in nearly 5 years, we can ensure that women who seek medical assistance through federally funded family planning clinics will have complete information on which to base the difficult and critical choices associated with pregnancy.

Free choice is possible only with complete information. Every woman who must make choices about pregnancy, benefits from complete information. Our society as a whole benefits from the decisions made by fully informed women.

I urge my colleagues not to allow any amendment to H.R. 670.

The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Virginia intrudes unnecessarily and inappropriately in an area that Federal regulation need not and should not enter.

H.R. 670 already includes adequate provision to ensure that parents are notified before abortion in States which have required such notification by State law.

This is not an area in which government should intrude. Many young women are fortunate enough to be members of supportive families whom they consult in the course of making decisions about their pregnancy.

It is the young women who do not enjoy the support and confidence of their families who alone will be affected by the proposed amendment. Federal regulation cannot create family support where it does not exist. Such requirements are far more likely to limit access to health care than to create support.

I am alarmed that more than 1½ million abortions are performed in this country every year. I am deeply concerned that so many of our teenaged young women become pregnant.

Let us direct our attention and energies to addressing the societal problems so often associated with early pregnancy.

Let us strengthen our educational system. It must speak to and stimulate all the young people of our country.

Let us strengthen our economy. People of all ages must be able to work in meaningful jobs.

Let us implement fundamental health care reform. All people must have access to quality medical care.

Authorizing title X is a good place to start. It funds a broad range of medical services to many who otherwise would receive none at all. Title X is also critical for providing information. Studies indicate that an additional 1.2 million unintended pregnancies would occur without title X funding.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the amendment and pass H.R. 670.

□ 1530

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD], the ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Madam Chairman, I believe the family planning program can and has served a very useful purpose in our society—to help low-income women plan their families. The key term regarding the program is planning.

Unfortunately, though, as a result of President Clinton's decision to overturn the regulations prohibiting counseling or referral for abortion, and as a result of the mandate in H.R. 670 that such counseling be provided, the program now validates abortion related activities as a means of dealing with an unwanted pregnancy. Consequently, I am unable to support H.R. 670.

I supported the regulations issued by the previous administration prohibiting title X grantees from engaging in counseling, referral for, and activities advocating abortion as a method of family planning. In my opinion, these regulations restored the integrity of the family planning program to what the Congress originally intended it to be—a pre-pregnancy program to either help women get pregnant or prevent pregnancy. I regret that both President Clinton's executive order and this bill reverse these regulations. Reversal of these regulations undeniably links abortion with family planning and as a result I must oppose passage of this legislation.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Chairman, in the past few years, we have seen a basic freedom—a woman's right to consult freely with her doctor—seriously threatened—not by outsiders, but by the Government itself.

I am speaking about the gag rule—a Federal regulation which would have affected every pregnant woman seeking treatment at a federally run family health clinic.

Supporters of the gag rule wanted to limit what doctors and nurses at these clinics could tell pregnant women

about options available to them, including abortion.

This is a case of big government being too much government.

Their Big Brother message to women was simple: We know what's best. The less you know, the better.

Madam Chairman, those days are over. The gag rule is dead. With his Executive order last January, President Clinton killed it. And this week, with the Family Planning Reauthorization Act, we stand ready to bury it.

No one in this country—least of all pregnant women—should be limited by their Government in the kind of information they can receive from their doctor.

I am proud to support this bill and I am proud that we have a President who will sign it.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman a couple of years ago, I met a remarkable young woman whose story underscores why, at a minimum, the Bliley amendment must be part of the title X program.

But first let me note with sadness, that as a direct result of President Clinton's recent order, title X is back in the business of abortion counseling and referral. Also, notwithstanding an obvious conflict of interest, abortion mills under the Clinton decree can, once again, be situated under the same roof and same ownership as a federally subsidized family planning project.

As a direct result of this linkage of abortion mills with family planning providers, more babies will suffer the cruelty of being dismembered by suction machines or being poisoned with various lethal chemicals. Only the most naive would believe otherwise.

As a direct result, more teenage moms will get abortions and suffer trauma, in some cases lifelong.

By now, Americans are beginning to recognize that with every abortion, one person is dead, the other wounded.

The Bliley amendment simply requires that at least one parent of a minor be notified that their daughter is scheduled for irreversible surgery—a type of procedure that destroys an unborn child.

A parent or legal guardian has a right to know if their daughter is seeking an abortion. Which brings me to the story of Erin Rettig, a courageous young woman I've met who, like millions of other teenagers, procured a secret abortion. And now desperately wishes she hadn't and desperately wishes her mom had been notified.

Erin Rettig relates her story, In March of 1985, exactly six years ago, we were having sex education in my P.E. class. The class was taught by a nurse from the Oroville Family Health Center, a Title X program. I had been afraid that I was preg-

nant, and the discussions so upset me that I ran from the room crying. Both my teacher and the Health Center nurse followed me outside to talk with me.

They made arrangements for me to go to the Health Center for a pregnancy test. They asked me if I was going to tell my mother. I did not want to disappoint my mom, so I told them I did not want her to know. They said my mother would never have to know. They asked me what I was going to do if I was pregnant. I said, "I guess I'll have an abortion." They said they could help, that it would be quick and easy, and they reassured me that my mother would never have to know.

After school the next day, my teacher took me to the Health Center. * * * I cried when I found out I was pregnant. The same nurse talked to me for about twenty minutes. She never encouraged me to talk with my mother, and she never explained to me that if I wanted to keep the baby, I could get financial help, medical help, and could even stay in school. Instead, she told me that if I was going to have an abortion, it would have to be done quickly. The nurse made an appointment for me to have an abortion at a clinic in the next town.

The nurse then talked with my teacher and told her all of the steps that would have to be taken to sign me up for welfare to pay for the abortion.

Each time I was out of school my teacher had to forge my daily reports to keep my mom from finding out I was pregnant.

My teacher took me. She sent a note home to my mom asking if I could babysit all day and spend the night.

At the abortion clinic, no one encouraged me to talk with my mother. I did not meet my doctor until I was already on the operating table.

Some of what I had been told was true. The abortion was quick. But it was not easy. And my mother did have to know, because at school next week, I began bleeding, and the school had to call my mother to get permission to take me to the hospital.

While I was recovering from the emergency surgery, and from the trauma of the abortion, I learned just how much my mother loved me and how much she cared about my best interests.

All of this happened six years ago. When I think back, I wish I could do it all over again. I wish my mother had known. I wish she had been there with me to help me decide what to do.

I know that if I had been told the truth, that I would have had that baby—I would not have had the abortion. My mother and my family would have helped me during my difficult time. I know that now—I wish I had been given the chance to find that out then.

Mr. Chairman, our compassion and concern for young girls, for minors like Erin Rettig—minors—should inspire us to support the Bliley amendment no matter what the extremists in the pro-abortion lobby say.

Finally, let me say that I strongly believe that parents are usually well aware of their children's medical history and can anticipate possible complications that may accompany a surgical procedure. Parents can also provide guidance and support to a minor child who might be frightened or confused. Parental consultation is usually required for a teenager to have a tooth drilled, get an eye exam, go on a school trip or get ears pierced. Certainly, par-

ents have a right to be involved, at least notified in life-and-death decisions such as abortion.

Dr. James Rogers, author of a study on parental notification which was published in the March 1991 issue of the *American Journal of Public Health*, shows scientifically that abortion rates and pregnancy rates for minor girls declined dramatically after Minnesota's parental notification law went into effect. The average abortion rate among 15- to 17-year-old minors declined by 28.3 percent, Dr. Rogers reported.

The Missouri Department of Health reported a decline of 12.5 percent in "the percentage of aborted pregnancies to minors" between 1985 and 1988. This development coincided with the enforcement of a parental consent statute that had previously been tied up in the courts.

The Bliley amendment is the least we can do to help women and young girls of our country.

Finally because H.R. 670 facilitates abortions alternative via counseling and approval, because title X family planning clinics can be colocated with abortion mills, and because substantive reform amendments were blocked from being considered—I urge a "no" vote on H.R. 670.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to respond very briefly to the comment by the gentleman from New Jersey. He told a story about a young woman who had an abortion who regretted it and wished her mother had known.

I want to tell a story of a young woman by the name of Becky Bell who feared, because of the State law on parental notification, that her mother and father would disapprove, so she left the State, had an abortion, and, unfortunately, died.

□ 1540

Her mother said she wished there had not been that parental notification law.

Second, notwithstanding whatever the views are and how abortion ought to be handled, this bill is not about abortion. This bill is about family planning, contraception. And the story that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] told us, as I recall, had nothing to do with a clinic that got title X funds. So if he wanted the Bliley amendment, it would not have even applied to that clinic that provided abortion services.

The issue of abortion and parental notification should not be decided on this bill. It should be decided on some bill dealing with abortion. It ought to be decided at the State level, not the Federal level.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a very important member of our committee, a leader on this whole question of reproductive rights, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support for H.R. 670. This

legislation allows us to take a big step forward to try to catch up for the many years of backward movement we have experienced in our attempts to provide complete information to women and families about family planning.

The past two administrations have acted as if the world was a crisp and clean television sitcom in which everything always worked out perfectly. Well, it just isn't that simple. In the real world women get pregnant and sometimes find it necessary for various, myriad reasons to select pregnancy management options. This is not something revolutionary—it is an incapable fact.

Often the women who come to family planning clinics face the most difficult decisions of their lives without full knowledge of pregnancy management options including prenatal care and delivery, adoption, birth control pills, and devices, and so on. The least we can do is provide them with access to the complete range of information and services available.

The recent violence at clinics and medical offices across the country has heightened the volatile nature of the debate about pregnancy termination. We in the Congress must keep cool heads and send a clear signal that we are supportive of the efforts of the front-line professionals who are providing the counseling and services.

H.R. 670 would require the title X clinics to offer basic, nondirective information on prenatal care, infant care, foster care, adoption and so on. Without this information it would be impossible for these clinics to fulfill their role of adequately and totally informing their clients about family planning.

The epidemic growth in teenage pregnancy is of major concern to all of us. So too, is the growth in unplanned pregnancies by adults. Both can lead to health and social problems such as low birth weight babies, unloved children and recurring generations of poverty, to name a few.

Family planning clinics provide a significant portion of the information that reaches our poorest citizens on issues that will have a lasting impact on their lives. What we do here today matters. It matters to the woman who is facing the most traumatic decision of her life. It matters to the young family trying to plan for its future. It matters in the most basic and personal way.

As this debate progresses in the House and in the other body you will hear from a variety of speakers who will offer amendments under the guise of improving the bill. I urge my colleagues to carefully evaluate these attempts to weaken this legislation. Many would try to decrease the effectiveness of this program with Trojan horse-like measures which appear to be

tiveness of this program with Trojan horse-like measures which appear to be reasonable, but all too often make the work of these clinics less accessible to women.

Mr. Chairman, I heartily endorse H.R. 670 and urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEVY].

Mr. LEVY. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely regret that so much of the debate on this bill has centered on the issue of women's rights and abortion.

In fact, this bill does little to advance women's rights because it does little to change national policy: What it does with respect to those issues is merely to codify policies that already exist by virtue of President Clinton's Executive order dated January 22.

The bill does do one thing, however, that the President cannot do without congressional help. It spends money.

The legislation that is before us today proposes to increase family planning spending by almost \$162 million—or more than 50 percent over the next 2 years.

Let us not be fooled. A vote for this bill is not a pro-choice vote; it is a vote to dig deeper into the pockets of middle-class Americans who are already paying too much in taxes and whose economic well-being is, I think, increasingly threatened by what we do here.

It is absolutely irresponsible, as we promise to cut the deficit, for us to be considering legislation which increases spending as H.R. 670 does.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON].

Mr. EMERSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill—not because I oppose family planning, but because I oppose abortion. I strongly support family planning, and I truly wish that we could pass a family planning bill that everyone could support and then hash out the abortion issues separately. Why do they have to be linked? The plain fact of the matter is quite simple: Abortion is not family planning. Planning is something you do before pregnancy; abortion is something that comes after pregnancy. Abortion and family planning should not be in the same bill, but the majority here seems to treat the two as indistinguishable.

This bill does several things to promote abortion. It places abortion on a par with prenatal care, delivery, and adoption with regard to counseling and referrals; according to this bill, abortion is just another pregnancy management option—a rather cold and clinical way to describe a procedure that ends the life of a human being. The require-

ment for abortion counseling and referral extends even to those who conscientiously object to abortion and would rather not participate in abortion in any way—this bill tells them that if they want to continue to work toward the prevention of pregnancy, they must also refer for abortions. What will be next—will we require family planners to give women bus fare to abortion clinics?

This bill also requires that family planners give any individual information about abortion counseling and referral upon request. Not pregnant women, not title X clients—any individual. I think that the hard-earned tax dollars funding title X would be better used if they actually went toward preventing pregnancy in the first place than toward providing abortion information to anyone who happens to ask for it.

This bill moves title X—originally a worthy program—away from its original intent of preventing unwanted pregnancies and toward a goal of encouraging and advocating abortion—all with taxpayer dollars. I urge Members to oppose H.R. 670.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 670, the Family Planning Amendments of 1993, and I commend the chairman for bringing this crucial legislation to the floor.

The title X program has been one of the most highly respected and successful Federal health programs, but the program has been held hostage to politics over the last decade. As a result, the title X program has gone unauthorized, and funding has not been able to respond to the critical need for services.

Today, in passing this bill without crippling amendments, we can renew our commitment to critical family planning programs that improve women's health and prevent unintended pregnancies. Surely we can all agree on these goals.

Studies show that 3.1 million unintended pregnancies are averted each year because of publicly funded contraceptive services. Additionally, over \$4 in health and welfare costs are saved for each public dollar invested in family planning. But today the United States leads all Western countries in teen pregnancy and childbearing rates. That reality has led to a growing national consensus on the importance of supporting family planning programs. H.R. 670 will act on that consensus and give new substance to these essential programs.

And, as we embark on the task of reforming our health care system, I want to remind my colleagues that the title X program goes far beyond family plan-

ning services. For some 85 percent of those who utilize title X clinics, it is their only source of medical care. In the process, millions of Americans have gained access to cost-effective preventive health care services thanks to title X.

I urge my colleagues to join me in advancing an agenda that will reduce unintended pregnancies and improve public health.

Vote "yes" on H.R. 670.

□ 1550

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, this bill puts some of us in a very difficult position. I believe that many unwanted pregnancies can be avoided through open counseling and complete information on reproductive health care, and to reduce the number of unwanted pregnancies and abortions, which I oppose.

I rise in strong support of the title X Federal Family Planning Program. In Wyoming, these facilities play an important role in helping families plan for children. For me, education is the best way this Nation can reduce unwanted pregnancies before they happen. It is my opinion, as well, that by preventing unwanted pregnancies through open counseling and complete information on reproductive health care, we can lessen abortions, which I oppose.

But I intend to vote against the bill because I have to tell you, I am absolutely disturbed by the 56 percent increase in spending for this bill during a time when the people of this country and the Congress are clamoring for cuts. In this act, even if we held it to last year's funding level, that would be something I could support. But a 56-percent increase over previous levels is not at all in line with what should be this body's commitment to balancing the budget. I resent being put in this position to vote against a program I support because of irresponsible spending increases.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, this bill will give an opportunity to those who have limited funds and limited access to medical facilities to enjoy the benefits that are available to all others, and for that reason I rise in strong support of H.R. 670.

I have had the privilege on a number of occasions to visit family planning clinics and to talk to the people who were there. I will tell you that the benefits from those clinics when observed first-hand are clear, not only to the families, not only to the individuals involved, but to society as a whole.

I am deeply troubled when I hear comments from the other side of the

aisle from those who say it will cost us. Rather than costing us, this bill will be beneficial and in the long run will save money for society.

By avoiding unwanted pregnancies, we are going to avoid the problem of children who are born and who become a burden on society. We are going to avoid the problem of young teenage mothers who have unwanted pregnancies and have their education curtailed.

For all these reasons, as well as the beneficial health aspects of it as well, I rise in strong support of H.R. 670 and I urge all Members of the House to join in an affirmative vote on this legislation.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY].

Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY. Mr. Chairman, I raise today to voice my opposition to the Bliley amendment to House Resolution 690, the family planning reauthorization bill.

The Bliley amendment would require any woman visiting a title X clinic to notify one parent about her private decision. In addition, this restrictive amendment does not allow for judicial bypass.

All responsible parents hope that their child will come to them to discuss this kind of important decision. But I have seen the other side. As a reporter, I have been in a clinic with a young girl whose parents, I was told, regularly took part in operation rescue activities outside this clinic. This girl told me that she would rather kill herself than tell her parents. For this young woman, parental notification did not mean open communication. It meant an illegal abortion or worse.

The net result of this amendment is that all title 10 clinics will refuse this Federal funding, and will not be able to serve the many women who desperately need these services and counseling.

The Bliley amendment may force some women into dangerous decisions, and I urge my colleagues to defeat it and to stand up for the reproductive rights of American women.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SCHENK].

Ms. SCHENK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong and unqualified support of H.R. 670, and I urge my colleagues to support its passage without amendment.

I am pleased and gratified that the House is considering this landmark legislation, which will finally bring American family planning policy back into modern times and modern reality. This is a matter of utmost importance to American women and one which is a focal point for women in my district.

Family planning decisions are the most important health care decisions American women will make in their

lifetimes—and yet, many women of child-bearing age cannot afford private counseling and treatment. Congress established the network of federally funded clinics so that all women, regardless of income, might receive sincere, objective, and professional counseling.

Unfortunately, 12 long years of archaic, reactionary administration policy have crippled the ability of clinics to meet the overwhelming demand for family planning services. Congress has failed to reauthorize title X in nearly a decade. As a result, funding for title X services has been frozen—limiting both the quality and availability of family planning services.

Even worse, the past two administrations have denied women the most basic information about their family planning options. Five years ago, the Reagan administration issued the infamous gag rule, preventing federally funded clinics from even discussing the full range of options—including the option of terminating one's pregnancy.

H.R. 670 ends this regressive chapter in the history of American health care. It authorizes appropriate increases in funding for title X services so that clinics can expand their staffs to meet the overwhelming demand for counseling services.

Best of all, H.R. 670 lifts the gag rule, and restores the fundamental right of all American women to make informed decisions about their reproductive health.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 670 restores common sense to our family planning system. I urge my colleagues to vote for this landmark legislation.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to briefly discuss in a couple minutes the Dornan amendment that was not allowed under this restricted rule as well as two other amendments that are coming up in which each side will have 30 minutes to discuss.

Unfortunately, my amendment was not found in order, and I think it is ridiculous. My amendment would establish a means test for receiving services at title X family planning clinics. The Dornan amendment would have prevented the daughters of millionaires, billionaires, Congressmen, and other wealthy Americans from going to a clinic and saying, "My parents have been stiffing me on my allowance. I am poor. I want these taxpayer funded services."

The Dornan proposal would merely have redefined the term low-income family—the target group that was originally intended to be the beneficiaries of title X family planning services. In doing so, it would have simply ensured that those receiving these services are truly in financial need, falling at or below 150 percent of the official poverty line.

It would also have required that an unemancipated minor's total family income be considered prior to determining that minor's ability to pay. This would effect only those minors still dependent on their parents or other legal guardians. Current law asks middle class families to pay for title X services received by the children of millionaires or the children of persons at the congressional pay level. This is wrong. But perhaps more important the Dornan amendment would have resulted in more parental notification. But that was not allowed on the floor.

I also want to take this opportunity to speak on the DeLay amendment which is trying to address the serious problem of the lack of maturity or experience among people who provide important counsel in planned parenthood centers.

The gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN], my good friend and esteemed colleague, has tried to inject more reason into the process, I guess. He wants to add to the list of those allowed to provide pregnancy counseling, persons who meet criteria established by the Secretary of HHS and persons allowed to provide such counseling under State law. Leaving it up to the Secretary of Health and Human Services is fine, I could accept that under the DeLay amendment; but any State law that is silent on who may or may not provide counseling on pregnancy management options, that makes it appear that anyone trained or untrained, could be allowed to provide such counseling in title X clinics. That is what we have now if we consider the preliminary reports from Planned Parenthood which profiled 500 of their individual counselors and found that they are largely young, totally inexperienced, unpaid and probably, obviously, using the job for training experience and preparation for other jobs in the future.

□ 1600

And although the so-called gag rule is still nefariously, mentioned as some terrible chapter in medical history, it was just this type of situation it was meant to address.

Remember, President Bush made it perfectly clear that doctors could do whatever they wanted. What we were trying to get at was the young teen-aged, unpaid volunteered, so-called counselors telling other frightened, young teenagers, "This is the way to go. If you don't want your child, kill your child, and you're saving your country an economic burden."

And by the way, Mr. Chairman, one of the four major suppressed stories last year: We will sell the placenta, and maybe something else, to European cosmetic firms where they will work it into face creams, and bring it back to America and sell it to American women. Fact.

Read "Operation Spike" by a bipartisan panel of journalists about that spiked story.

The third amendment that is allowed, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT] I will discuss during the time for that amendment.

Mrs. MORELLA. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Family Planning Amendments Act, H.R. 670.

Title X has been the focus of our national family planning effort since 1970, providing funding to more than 4,000 family planning clinics for medical and educational services to over 5.3 million low-income women and teenagers. While title X supported clinics focus primarily on contraceptive services, they also provide preventive health care. In fact, they are the only source of health care for over 50 percent of their patients. These clinics offer health screening, treatment, or referrals for cervical and breast cancer, anemia, sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV, hypertension, kidney dysfunction, and diabetes.

Each year, federally funded family planning programs prevent 1.2 million unintended pregnancies. And there has always been a prohibition on the use of title X funds for abortions. Clearly, this program is one of the most effective preventive public health care programs, and yet, it has gone unauthorized for 7 years and has suffered severe funding cuts.

H.R. 670 also overturns the outrageous restrictions of the gag rule. While President Clinton has already issued an Executive order suspending the gag rule, Congress must also overturn it to ensure that it is not reinstated in the future. The gag rule was a clear violation of the first amendment, would have resulted in defensive medicine, and would have created a class system for women's health. It was patronizing to women and it must be permanently overturned.

I also urge my colleagues to defeat all weakening amendments to the bill, particularly the Bliley amendment. I strongly believe that minors should have parental consent for an abortion whenever possible. However, laws mandating parental involvement can actually harm the teens and families they are intended to protect, by increasing illegal and self-induced abortions, family violence, suicide, and later abortions. H.R. 670 requires that title X grantees comply with applicable State law regarding minors' access to abortions.

The Bliley amendment would supersede the State laws for title X clinics in all but three States. It would establish very strict requirements for parental notification, making exceptions only if a mother's life is in immediate danger—thereby excluding serious medical conditions, such as AIDS or diabetes.

The amendment's exception for rape or incest would only apply if the incest was committed by the father or legal guardian; no exception is provided for other family members. No judicial bypass would be allowed, unless the State already has such a mechanism established.

States that failed to comply with these requirements would lose their Federal family planning funding, even though Federal funds are never used to pay for abortions.

Our focus should be on preventing unintended pregnancies and the need for abortions. Title X is a key part of this effort and it must be reauthorized so that low-income

women can continue to receive these critical health services. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 670 and to oppose all weakening amendments.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 670, the reauthorization of the Title X Family Planning Program. Since the mid-1980's this legislation has been the source of bitter debate between the past two Republican administrations and the Congress. By renewing our commitment to the Title X Program, Congress will show the American public that common sense can prevail over Washington gridlock.

Funding for family planning services enables low-income women to take responsibility for their reproductive health, as well as assisting women in determining the number and timing of their pregnancies. By overturning the gag rule, Congress sends a strong message to this Nation that American women have a right to uncensored information about pregnancy options, regardless of income.

Not only does this program provide much needed family planning services but also offers other vital health services such as screening for breast and cervical cancer, diabetes, and HIV, as well as providing community education and outreach. Family planning clinics play an essential role in providing health services to their clients. For over 85 percent of the patients who visit title X clinics, these clinics are their only source of health care.

One of the populations most in need of family planning services is American teenagers. Each year, 1 in every 11 American females between the ages of 15 and 19 has a birth or an abortion, figures which are significantly greater than many European countries. Federally funded family planning services are essential in reducing our Nation's astounding teen pregnancy rate, as well as relieving the many negative impacts of teen pregnancy on educational advancement and employment opportunities.

Finally, I wish to emphasize that funding the Title X Family Planning Program is money well spent. Every \$1 spent on contraceptive services saves the taxpayer \$4.40 in short-term mandated services to support unintended pregnancy and birth.

In light of the essential role family planning clinics play in the lives of millions of women of reproductive age, I strongly support the reauthorization of the Title X Family Planning Program and urge its swift passage.

Mr. KLECZKA. Madam Chairman, today I rise to express my strong support for passage of H.R. 670, a bill to reauthorize funding for the Title X Family Planning Program, and urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in voting for this bill.

It is unfortunate the politics of abortion in general, and the gag rule in particular, have prevented Congress from enacting a title X authorization bill for nearly a decade. Counseling and referrals for pregnancy management options are only a few of the numerous services provided by title X clinics.

More importantly, the program also underwrites basic and reproductive health services for more than 4 million women, with priority given to low-income adults and teens. In the Fourth Congressional District of Wisconsin, which I represent, the Title X Program fi-

nances these important services for more than 13,000 women. Moreover, title X birth control services prevent at least 1.2 million unintended pregnancies nationwide each year, thereby precluding an estimated 516,000 abortions. In addition, it should be noted that for every \$1 invested in family planning services, the Federal Government saves \$4.40 in mandatory social services. By voting today to authorize title X funds for fiscal years 1994 and 1995, we would save money in the long term while ensuring that women in my district and yours continue receiving vital health services over the next 2 years.

Turning to the gag rule issue, it is reasonable and wise to restore in law the Title X Program's counseling and referral policy on pregnancy management options. This policy was replaced in 1992 by the gag rule, that bars clinic professionals from discussing abortion with a patient under nearly all circumstances. Before the gag rule took effect, clinic personnel were required to offer comprehensive and nondirective counseling on the legal options available to a woman faced with an unplanned pregnancy, included information on pre-natal care and delivery; child care; foster care and adoption; and abortion. Referrals to providers of the service chosen by the woman were also offered by clinic personnel. The gag rule clearly eliminated a sensible policy that from 1970 to 1992 limited the demand for abortions while enabling women to receive the information needed to make fully informed decisions about their care. Accordingly, I am pleased that H.R. 670 would place into law the nondirective counseling and referral policy once used by title X clinics.

In addition, this bill allows individual title X projects or personnel that are morally opposed to abortion to refuse to supply counseling or referrals for it, as long as they direct the patient toward another provider that is willing and qualified to provide such counseling and referrals.

Finally, H.R. 670 deserves our support because it does not weaken current Federal law that bars title X clinics from using taxpayer funds to perform abortions. I oppose Government financing of abortion except in cases of rape, incest, or if by continuing a pregnancy a woman's life would be endangered or her health impaired.

It is time to set aside politics as usual and authorize funding for the beneficial Title X Program. Let me emphasize again that the program's goal is the prevention of unwanted pregnancies and abortions; there has always been a prohibition on the use of funds for abortions. Thousands of unintended pregnancies and abortions have been prevented each year, thanks to title X. Millions of dollars have been saved in other medical and social services. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to vote for passage of H.R. 670.

Mr. PENNY. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 670, the Family Planning Amendments of 1993. I am extremely pleased that, after years of inaction, we are finally able to reauthorize the Title X Family Planning Program for an additional 2 years.

Family planning—and the program authorized under this act—is good policy. Without the availability of title X family planning services, it is estimated that there would be at

least 1.2 million additional unwanted pregnancies each year, leading to perhaps as many as 500,000 additional abortions. It is the prevention of these unwanted pregnancies where those like me who hold pro-life views and those like President Clinton who hold pro-choice views can find agreement. We can and must support American families through making sure that Federal dollars are available to keep family planning services and basic health care readily accessible to women throughout the country in all areas—rural and urban.

This legislation also contains sufficient safeguards separating the issues of family planning and abortion. Title X prohibits the use of family planning funds for abortion services. The bill specifically requires that any counseling provided is nondirective. Information on all pregnancy options, including prenatal care and delivery, infant care, foster care and adoption, and pregnancy termination will not be presented to a patient unless that patient requests the information.

Additionally, the bill includes a provision that individual title X providers as well as individual counselors are exempted from discussing specific pregnancy options, such as abortion, if they object to that option on religious or moral grounds.

Finally, while I strongly support this legislation, I do intend to support the amendment offered by Mr. BLILEY. I believe that adoption of a Federal standard regarding parental notification is a positive step.

Most important, however, is the hundreds of thousands of abortions that will be prevented through the availability of effective family planning services.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of the Family Planning Amendment Act of 1993. For years, family planning clinics have provided counseling and health services to primarily low-income women, offering them an opportunity to make informed decisions on family planning. I have been a strong supporter of programs offered through title X and believe that we must ensure that both men and women receive high-quality care.

Family planning is especially crucial in my State where teen pregnancy ranks the second highest in the country. A majority of the clients who visit family planning clinics live at or below the poverty line, yet are not eligible for Medicaid. As a result, family planning clinics are often the first, and sometimes the only, contact these women have with health care professionals.

Family planning also makes economical sense. Citing my State as an example again, it is estimated that every \$1 spent on family planning in California saves \$11.20 in public costs associated with unintended pregnancy. These costs include Medicaid delivery, maternity and infant care, Medicaid abortions, AFDC, food stamps, and other social services.

Madam Chairman, I would like to add that I strongly support codifying the revision of the gag rule. In funding title X, we have a responsibility to ensure that clients visiting publicly funded clinics receive quality medical care and are fully informed regarding available options, including information on their reproductive lives. I believe one of the most effective ways to prevent unwanted pregnancies, and thus

the number of abortions, is to throw our complete support behind family planning programs. This requires providing sufficient funding as well as enacting appropriate policies.

By appropriate policies I mean that doctors must be given the freedom to answer patients' inquiries and to provide accurate and complete information on family planning. Government has no place in telling doctors which legal medical procedures they are allowed to discuss with their patients. Accordingly, Government has no place in denying patients the right to receive nondirective counseling on pregnancy management options.

If we allow the controversy that the so-called gag rule inspires to obstruct the funding of title X programs, we will be undermining the proven successes of family planning programs. For the sake of the many people who depend on clinics funded under title X, we simply cannot let this happen. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. SNOWE. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Family Planning Amendments Act of 1993.

With the passage of this legislation, over 4 million low-income women across America will have improved access to family planning services and preventative health care. This is particularly important because, for 83 percent of title X clients, family planning clinics are their only source of primary health care.

The passage of the legislation before us today is significant for two major reasons. First, the bill strengthens the title X program by increasing its authorization to a more appropriate level. As many of you know, this program has not been reauthorized since 1984, and as a result, its funding suffered greatly over the last decade.

This is particularly regretful because significant savings in public dollars can be realized through effective family planning—every \$1 spent on family planning saves \$4.40 in public health and welfare costs.

The second important component of this legislation is the requirement that title X clinics provide their clients with complete pregnancy counseling. As a result of this provision, there will never again be a Government-enforced gag rule on the information doctors can provide to their patients. Never again will a woman's economic status determine the medical information she is allowed to receive.

This legislation sends a clear message to American women that the Federal Government trusts them to make responsible decisions regarding their health care.

Members of the House, everyday, thanks to the guidance and resources of family planning clinics, thousands of low-income women are protected against sexually transmitted diseases and unwanted pregnancy. Therefore, there is no better investment that both sides of the abortion debate can make than strongly supporting family planning programs.

Madam Chairman, those who support both antiabortion and contraception policies leave women with no realistic alternative to unwanted pregnancy. This position only exacerbates the current crisis of unwanted pregnancy and abortion and does nothing to solve these problems.

The entire thrust of the title X bill is solving this crisis through prevention. Family planning

is one of the most effective tools in reducing the incidence of abortion and should be recognized as such.

For all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Family Planning Amendments Act of 1993.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Madam Chairman, I find it fascinating that opponents of the Bliley parental notification amendment are attempting to frame this debate as a States' rights issue. Moreover, I object to the fact that we are asking the American taxpayer to pay for title X funds, yet are hearing arguments that the Federal Government should not be involved in the process. It cannot be argued logically that the Government must sponsor and subsidize—through tax dollars—this family planning program and not have any involvement in how and to whom those funds should be dispersed.

I am an ardent supporter of States rights and object to the Federal Government interfering with those rights when it is indeed an issue of States rights. However, contrary to how the opposition would paint the picture, the Bliley amendment is consistent with these rights. Title X is entirely a Federal program. That is, public and private nonprofit organizations apply on a voluntary basis and no matching of funds is required by the States or organizations choosing to participate. The Bliley amendment is not telling States what to do or invalidating their laws. It merely provides that those organizations which receive Federal funds through title X and perform abortions follow a true, not a loophole-ridden, parental notification requirement.

Madam Chairman, polls have consistently shown that 80 percent and more of the American people—whether they support abortion or not—strongly support parental notification laws. This amendment would merely bring this legislation, which calls upon the American taxpayer for funding, in line with the wishes of the majority of Americans.

Now I know that there are certain tragic situations in which a child would not be able to discuss the issue of abortion with her parents. The Bliley amendment has provided an exception for such extreme cases. The amendment allows for exceptions to the parental notification law to save a minor's life; if incest was involved in the pregnancy; or if the child is at risk of sexual abuse, child abuse, or neglect. In addition, it offers exception if the State is already in compliance with a State or local parental notification or consent law that allows only specific waivers.

Madam Chairman, this well-thought-out amendment should be included in the language of this bill to allow parents to be involved in such a life-threatening decision.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I had further requests for time, but none of those who have requested time are here at the moment. Therefore, if the minority is prepared to yield back its time, we are prepared to yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of our time as well.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO). Pursuant to the rule, the

bill is considered as read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of the bill, H.R. 670, is as follows:

H.R. 670

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Family Planning Amendments Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. PROJECT GRANTS AND CONTRACTS FOR FAMILY PLANNING SERVICES.

(a) **REQUIRING CERTAIN NONDIRECTIVE COUNSELING AND REFERRAL SERVICES.**—Section 1001 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) through (d) as subsections (c) through (e), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following subsection:

"(b)(1) The Secretary may not make an award of a grant or contract under this section unless the applicant for the award agrees that the family planning project involved will provide to individuals information regarding pregnancy management options upon request of the individuals.

"(2) With respect to compliance with the agreement made under paragraph (1), the family planning project involved, and any provider of services in the project, may not be required to provide information regarding a pregnancy management option if—

"(A) the project or provider (as the case may be) objects to doing so in grounds of religious beliefs or moral convictions; and

"(B) the project or provider refers the individual seeking services to another provider in the project, or to another project in the geographic area involved, as the case may be, that will provide such information.

"(3) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'information regarding pregnancy management options' means nondirective counseling and referrals regarding—

"(A) prenatal care and delivery;

"(B) infant care, foster care, and adoption; and

"(C) termination of pregnancy."

(b) **COMPLIANCE WITH STATE LAWS ON PARENTAL NOTIFICATION AND CONSENT.**—Section 1008 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300a-6) is amended by inserting "(a)" before "None" and by adding at the end the following:

"(b)(1) No public or nonprofit entity that performs abortions may receive an award of a grant or contract under section 1001 unless the entity has certified to the Secretary that the entity is in compliance with State law regarding parental notification of or consent for the performance of an abortion on a minor which is enforced in the State in which the entity is located.

"(2) Paragraph (1) shall not be construed to require or prohibit a State's abortion of parental notification or parental consent laws regarding the performance of an abortion on a minor, or to require or prohibit the enforcement by a State of such laws."

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Section 1001(e) of the Public Health Service Act, as redesignated by subsection (a) of this section, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) For the purpose of grants and contracts under this section, there are authorized to be appropriated \$220,000,000 for fiscal year 1994, and \$250,000,000 for fiscal year 1995."

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAINING GRANTS AND CONTRACTS.

Section 1003(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300a-1(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) For the purpose of grants and contracts under subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated \$6,250,000 for fiscal year 1994, and \$7,000,000 for fiscal year 1995."

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR INFORMATIONAL AND EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS.

Section 1005(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300a-3(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) For the purpose of grants and contracts under subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated \$12,000,000 for fiscal year 1994, and \$13,500,000 for fiscal year 1995."

SEC. 5. SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.**—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized in title X of the Public Health Service Act to be purchased with an award of a grant or contract under such title, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such an award should in expending the award purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) **NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF AWARDS.**—In making awards of grants and contracts under title X of the Public Health Service Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall provide to each recipient of such an award a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act take effect upon the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. No amendments to the bill are in order except the amendments printed in House Report 103-41, which may be offered only in the order printed and by the named proponent or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment, except as specified in House Report 103-41, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. Debate on each amendment will be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment.

The amendment in the form of a motion to strike specified in House Report 103-41 to be offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT] will not be in order if the text proposed to be stricken has been rewritten in its entirety by earlier amendment.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 103-41.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] rise?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELAY

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DELAY: Page 2, line 18, insert before the period the follow-

ing; "and that such information will be provided only through individuals holding professional degrees in medicine or osteopathic medicine, nursing, clinical psychology, the allied health professions, or social work".

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] will be recognized for 7½ minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] will be recognized for 7½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, in rising to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] I offer an amendment to his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] offering his amendment now?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELAY

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment to the amendment.

The text of the amendment to the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WAXMAN to the amendment offered by Mr. DELAY: In the matter proposed by the amendment to be inserted on page 2, line 18, of the bill, insert before the ending quotations the following: "through individuals meeting such other criteria as the Secretary determines to be appropriate for providing such information, or through individuals allowed under State law to provide such information".

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DELAY. Could the Chairman explain how we are going to proceed?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] now will have 15 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] will have 15 minutes to debate both amendments.

Mr. DELAY. So we will be debating both amendments.

Mr. Chairman, the first vote will be on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] when offered?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. DELAY. And we will just trade back and forth and use the 30 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. As usual, yes.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I really find it very surprising that my amendment is controversial. I think it is self-explanatory. It would require that counselors in title X clinics who are providing information on what H.R. 670 terms "pregnancy management options," that is, prenatal care, adoption and abortion, among others, have a profes-

sional degree in medicine, nursing, clinical psychology, the allied health professions, or social work. My reason for offering this is quite simple. If part of the purpose of the Title X Program is to provide quality care and advice to pregnant women, then I believe it is only reasonable to require that the advice be given by a qualified professional.

During all the debate on the so-called gag rule and this title X policy over the years, Mr. Chairman, we have heard from the proponents of the Title X Program that counseling is being done by professionals and that the Bush administration and those of us that oppose the process are gagging professional medical service providers and professional counselors. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I feel it is extremely important to emphasize that professionalism so that women, particularly underaged women that find themselves pregnant and come to a family planning clinic for advice, be protected from receiving uninformed or inexperienced advice.

It bothers me when I read from a Planned Parenthood preliminary report on the counseling function in their affiliates throughout the Nation that, and I quote:

Data from the nearly 500 individual counselor profiles give a clear picture of a counseling staff which is largely young and inexperienced, much of it working unpaid and probably using PPFA employment for training, experience and preparation for other jobs in the future. * * * Counselors' formal training is relatively modest * * *.

A lawsuit involving the Planned Parenthood Association of San Mateo County in California further illustrates my point. In this case, a Planned Parenthood employee, with the job title "Reproductive Health Specialist" stated in a deposition that she had had no prior experience or education in medical care, nor had she even had a biology course, before being hired for that position. Rather, the prior job experience of this so-called reproductive health specialist was as an architectural drafter for various corporations. She was given 2 months' on-the-job training by the center manager, who also had no prior medical training.

This reproductive health specialist was responsible not only for performing medical exams on clients, she was also charged with providing information on human reproduction and counseling pregnant women on their reproductive choices. There is something very wrong with this situation—if I were a woman who expected to receive professional care and advice when going to a federally funded clinic, I would find this very upsetting.

Even as recently as last month I noticed a help wanted ad in the Washington Post in which a northern Virginia Planned Parenthood clinic was advertising for a full-time educator-counselor. The ad reads as follows:

The clinic provides family planning, HIV & pregnancy options counseling and medical services. * * * College education desirable, bicultural and bilingual Spanish. Driver's license/car.

Isn't it sad, and even frightening, that for this pregnancy counseling position one must have a driver's license, but not a college degree? While I cannot comment as to the professionalism of this particular clinic or whether it receives title X funds, this ad serves as an obvious example of what my amendment attempts to correct. I do not think it is right for the Federal Government to fund clinics that hire individuals without even a college degree to counsel pregnant women on one of the most important decisions they are going to make in their lives.

It is my understanding after speaking with officials from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services that State law does not address the issue of educational standards for counselors in a meaningful way, if at all. Rather, private organizations attempt to establish such standards for their own members. For example, the Council on Accreditation of Services for Families and Children, which is sponsored by the Child Welfare League of America, the National Association of Homes and Services for Children, and the Lutheran Social Ministry System, among others, requires its agencies' personnel who provide counseling to an expectant parent on the decision to parent the child, to transfer custody of the child, or to terminate the pregnancy to have a master's degree from an accredited program of social work education, or have a bachelor's or master's degree in an allied field and are supervised by a person with a master's degree in social work.

□ 1610

Furthermore, in a November 1991 letter signed by 21 organizations, including the American Medical Association, the American College of Physicians, and the National Association of Community Health Centers, the words "health care professionals" appear seven times on one page in reference to those who would be affected by the counseling restrictions known as the gag rule. It is obvious that much of the health care community recognizes the need to require counselors to be qualified. Why is it then that situations such as the ones I described earlier continue to exist? It is vital that we address this problem now.

I am not asserting that all family planning clinics receiving title X funds are employing inexperienced counselors. However, even if only a few clinics are doing so, then we are not taking women's health care seriously enough. I believe requiring pregnancy counselors to have a professional degree can only enhance the title X Program. I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment, and a "no" vote on the Waxman second-degree amendment.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the DeLay amendment specifies the types of professionals that can provide counseling: doctors, nurses, allied health professionals, social workers, and clinical psychologists. These are all well-educated people and simply we would feel comfortable with them providing counseling.

But I do not think we ought to be so limiting as the DeLay amendment would have us do if it were adopted. It would make across-the-board determination of the question who would be permitted to counsel. Even though there are some rural and underserved urban areas where some counselors may be specially trained health care workers and some poverty health clinicians, the health professionals with degrees are already fully occupied giving actual health care services and the delegation of counseling is made to people working under their supervision who may not have the same degrees. We should allow, and my amendment would permit, the States to decide the competence of people who would do counseling. We should allow the Secretary to determine this issue as well.

So my amendment to the DeLay amendment would allow for counseling by those people authorized under State law to do this work, and would also authorize the Secretary of HHS to continue to establish criteria in this area.

This amendment is a most flexible approach to high quality health care. Family planning clinics have been short funded and shortstaffed for years now. If the DeLay amendment is adopted without this amendment to it, no matter how hard some of us may try to have more money provided for these clinics, if they do not get more funds they just will not be able to hire the counselors to give the needed counseling to people who come in.

These counselors must be directly supervised by licensed professionals. They must be trained and they must meet the standards set by the Secretary or by State law.

So we are offering the amendment to the DeLay amendment. I would oppose the DeLay amendment if it were not amended, because it would in fact prevent many women from getting any counseling by anyone. Nurse practitioners, psychologists, social workers, will not be available to them. If they are available at all, they will be working in other clinics and providing other services.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we should give the clinics, the States, and the Secretary the flexibility to use their money in the most efficient way possible, and my amendment does that. I urge an "aye" vote for the Waxman amendment to the DeLay amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, a few years ago, Planned Parenthood really slipped up by allowing us a small peek into their usually secret, hidden, and Byzantine world of abortion and the typical profile of those counselors who counsel mothers to get them.

When you remember that Planned Parenthood alone performs, counsels, and refers for well over 200,000 abortions each year—in 5-year time periods they kill more than 1 million kids—and when you recall that Planned Parenthood runs the largest chain of abortion mills in the land, insights concerning the caliber, experience, and suitability of their so-called counselors should be of a great interest to the Congress.

Especially when we're paying for it.

A Planned Parenthood report stated the fact:

Data from nearly 500 individual counselor profiles gives a clear picture of a counseling staff which is largely young and inexperienced, much of it working unpaid and probably using PPFA employment for training, experience and preparation for other jobs in the future. Counselors' formal training is relatively modest. Only 20 percent are certified in counseling.

A counseling staff that is young, inexperienced, with modest formal training, using the experience as a stepping stone for other employment—raises serious questions concerning the quality of counseling.

Mr. Chairman, a recent ad in the help wanted section of the Washington Post, Planned Parenthood advertises for counselors with a text that said, "College education desirable." In other words, health education credentials are not necessary. There are no health credential prerequisites.

Now if nonfederally funded abortion counseling projects want to employ inexperienced abortion counselors, there is perhaps, little we can do about it.

But if federally subsidized groups like Planned Parenthood—which, by the way, get tens of millions each year from Uncle Sam—want to use noncredentialed abortion counselors, it better be our business.

I believe we have a serious obligation to women, especially teenagers, who use the clinics to insist on a high level of professionalism, training, expertise, and education for counselors.

Mr. DELAY's amendment raises those standards, to protect women from hack counselors. DELAY requires that individuals have a professional degree in medicine or osteopathic medicine, nursing, clinical psychology, and allied health profession, or social work.

Mr. WAXMAN's substitute approach, however, is not only weak and ineffective but is designed to establish a lower standard of competency for counselors than that envisioned by Mr. DELAY. And I hope no one will be fooled by the

charade occurring here. Mr. WAXMAN's second-degree amendment again is offered as a killer amendment. By offering his amendments in the second degree, Mr. WAXMAN hopes to deprive this House of the opportunity to vote on Mr. DELAY's amendment. So much for openness and fairness.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot see how the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] could characterize a perfecting amendment to the DeLay amendment as a killer amendment. The DeLay amendment spells out certain professionals who would be eligible to give counseling, counseling only, at family planning clinics. My amendment would broaden that to say that a State could decide beyond those who are licensed health care professionals to serve in that capacity, provided, of course, they are trained appropriately and working under the supervision of someone who is a health professional.

This is an amendment that I think makes a lot of sense. Under any regular order of business in this institution, such an amendment would be appropriate to be considered.

Not only is it appropriate to be considered, it should be adopted. We live in a society where many people do not speak English. Why should not someone be able to counsel women about contraception in their own language? Why should they be precluded, if they are not a doctor, a nurse, psychologist licensed after years of training, a social worker licensed after years of training, but instead are women who have gone through instruction with these health professionals, working under the direction of health professionals and giving information, and only information, not medical services. So I think it is very appropriate to expand the list.

Now, one has to wonder why they want to be so restrictive in, who in fact, can give this counseling.

□ 1620

I would suspect that if the gentleman wanted to deny women counseling, he would say, "Well, the best thing to say is only a doctor could provide that counseling." After all, that is what the Bush administration proposed in their rule.

They were going to say no one could even tell the truth to a woman if she wanted to know about abortion. No one else but a doctor could tell her that information; knowing full well that in most family planning clinics, they could not afford to have a doctor. They had nurse practitioners. Instead, they said a nurse practitioner did not have sufficient competence.

Now some of these Members who are opposed to family planning and counseling are saying it should only be a doctor or nurse practitioner but not

anyone else. So I think we ought to look behind what may be at stake in this issue insofar as this amendment is dealing with the real problem that we want competent personnel.

I think the States are competent to decide who ought to be giving counseling. They, after all, license professionals. We do not do that at the Federal level. Let the States make that decision.

I think the Secretary can adopt guidelines so that we have qualified personnel to give counseling and this counseling is about contraception. It is about where else to go for services, if the services are not provided at that family planning clinic.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

The fact that this report from Planned Parenthood is a few years old and that nothing has been done in a number of States, there is no real regulation insuring that these title X and other types of family planning providers, including abortion counselors, do not have the kinds of credentials. There is no standards in many States.

We have an opportunity today to help establish a standard so that competent medical or degreed or credentialed people, people who have a degree perhaps in counseling and, as I pointed out, this report said that only 20 percent of the counselors had a background where they received formal training in counseling.

That means that 80 percent do not have it. I would suggest to the gentleman that there are a number of people out there, and I have met many women who have been counseled improperly in their view, were not given all the options as a result. And they were by people who were either part-time or they were people who were just working at the clinic but did not have those kinds of credentials.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, it seems to me that if there is a problem in any institution where someone working in a capacity under someone else is not doing the job adequately, then the supervisors ought to be informed. But there are supervisors in every one of these clinics.

I think the States should be able to make the decisions for themselves in terms of who they think ought to be able to counsel. And I do not think all the answers come from Washington. I do not think they come particularly from those Members who do not want to give all the real information, who do not want to tell women about their rights and then do not want to let a woman decide for herself if she wants to use contraception and avoid pregnancy or even decide for herself if she wants to terminate a pregnancy.

I think that we ought to allow the States and the Secretary to establish the qualifications. And if we hear about people acting inappropriately, we report them to their supervisors or the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the matter is straightened out, rather than adopt an amendment that would be a straitjacket to keep counselors from being available.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO). The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I know the Chairman does not want to mislead the House about what my amendment says.

My amendment specifically lays out that social workers are included.

Members must understand that these health providers do more than just counseling. In some cases, they offer medical exams.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELAY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say to the gentleman that I rise in support of his amendment, that the amendment provides that the individuals who provide counseling to women in title X clinics have a degree in medicine, nursing, clinical psychology, the allied health profession or, at least, social work, that they have one of these degrees.

I think it is a good amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Texas. The amendment provides that the individuals who provide counseling to the women at title X clinics have a degree in medicine, nursing, clinical psychology, the allied health profession, or social work.

The amendment is necessary because currently most of the counselors at these clinics have little to no professional training or education. A report prepared for the Planned Parenthood Federation of America describes the situation at many clinics. On page 1 of the introduction, the report states, "The fact that many affiliates rely to a large extent on unpaid part-time counselors is documented."

On page nine of the report there is a section entitled, characteristics of individual counselors, data from the counselor profiles. Let me quote from this section.

Data from the nearly 500 individual counselor profiles give a clear picture of a counseling staff which is largely young and inexperienced, much of it working unpaid, and probably using PPFA. Planned Parenthood Federation of America employment for training, experience and preparation for other jobs in the future.

Counselors' formal training is relatively modest, which is presumably related to the training efforts made by the affiliates.

Mr. Chairman, we recently considered the National Institutes of Health reauthorization on

the floor. During the debate on that bill, we heard over and over again that finally something was being done about women's health. It is interesting that the same Members who are so concerned about women's health are willing to let individuals with no professional training in medicine or mental health counsel poor women about very important decisions regarding their reproductive health.

I urge my colleagues to vote "Yes" on the DeLay amendment.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that the gentleman has not read his amendment. His amendment talks about counselors only and not about people giving medical services. Medical services would have to be provided by people who are licensed to give those services.

The amendment speaks only to those who sit and advise people as to where to go for services or to talk about the kinds of things in a counseling session that would be counseling exclusive.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, that is not entirely correct. My amendment applies to those who provide information on pregnancy management options, which includes persons with the title "reproductive health specialist."

We all know, and I have evidence of this, that often these people do more than just counsel.

Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to accept the portion of the gentleman's amendment which adds to my list of those allowed to provide pregnancy counseling, persons who meet criteria established by the Secretary of HHS. However, I have some serious concerns with the second part of the amendment, which adds to the list those persons who are allowed to provide such counseling under State law.

In the first place, I am concerned about the impact Mr. WAXMAN's amendment would have should State law be absent of any provisions regarding educational standards for counseling, and it is my understanding that, for the most part, State law is not specific in this regard. Since the gentleman's amendment appears to give State law a weight equal to criteria established by the HHS Secretary and my list of professional degrees that would become Federal law, if passed, it seems this would mean anyone could provide counseling, even a 17-year-old high school volunteer, if State law did not set specific educational requirements.

Furthermore, and this brings me to my second concern, suppose a State's laws did identify certain educational prerequisites to counsel for pregnancy, but they were less stringent than the Federal standards, such as requiring only a high school degree, or even a college degree but not in a social

science or medical field. Under the Waxman amendment, it seems the standards set by State law would be sufficient for receiving title X funds, and we would find ourselves in the curious situation of having set Federal minimum standards for receiving Federal funding, and having these standards violated by recipients who are complying with State law. Since when has State law superseded Federal law when it comes to Federal funding? In essence, it seems this amendment would be making it legal for States to disobey Federal law. Interesting, but ridiculous.

I believe Mr. WAXMAN is concerned about States rights being infringed upon by Federal regulation, a concern which I certainly share. However, this is not an issue of States' rights. My amendment does not require a professional degree for pregnancy counselors across the board. It simply sets such standards at family planning clinics receiving title X funds. If a clinic does not wish to meet these standards, then it is under no obligation to participate in the Title X Program, and can continue to provide family planning services independently. Furthermore, States are free to establish any standards they wish for counseling, whether more or less stringent than the federal standards—it is up to each clinic individually to determine whether it meets or wishes to meet the Federal standards and receive title X funding.

It has always been, and continues to be, perfectly legitimate for the Federal Government to establish minimum criteria that must be met to be eligible to receive Federal funds. In fact, it is expected that the Federal Government set standards with regard to its allocation of money. It would be absurd to argue that States have the right to twist and turn Federal programs to implement them in whatever way they may desire.

By allowing State law to supersede Federal law, it is obvious that the Waxman amendment would completely undermine the intent of my amendment, which is to set high standards for Federal health care providers. As I stated earlier, pregnancy counselors advise women on one of the most important decisions they'll ever make in their lives—if the Federal Government is funding such counseling, then I strongly believe it has a responsibility to ensure that such counseling is provided by qualified professionals.

Don't settle for less.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on the Waxman amendment and a "yes" vote on the DeLay amendment.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time we have remaining.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The language of this DeLay amendment says that such information will be provided only through individuals holding professional degrees in medicine or osteopathic medicine, nursing, clinical psychology, allied health professions, or social work. The key thing is "such information."

We are talking about who can give information in a family planning clinic. I think all those professionals ought to be able to give information, but I do not think they are the only ones that should be permitted to give information. I think that if a State wants to enable others to give information, they should not be precluded from it. I do not think that the Secretary seeing that this program is administered the way Congress intends should preclude others from giving information. And if in a community where English is not the first language for most of the community, then I think that a person working in that clinic who speaks the language of the community, working under the direction of a health professional, ought to be able to give information, give counseling.

□ 1630

In rural areas where they will not have, sometimes, available to them doctors, social workers, osteopathic medics, or licensed health professionals, I think they ought to be able to have paraprofessionals to give information. We are not talking about medical services, but information.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the amendment we are offering to the DeLay amendment is a reasonable one. This clarifies the situation, and I would urge its adoption.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO). The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] has no time remaining.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I really salute the gentleman for his amendment, because I think it makes an incredible amount of sense. I used to be the attorney for Rocky Mountain Planned Parenthood, and the gentleman is pointing out some excellent points. No. 1, when we went onto the reservations where native Americans were, it was important often to have interpreters. The gentleman's amendment over here would make things very, very confused as to how this could be done with interpreters, what we can do.

Second, it is very clear that every State has been very, very strong in regulating the medical clinics and everything that is under their domain. They license people, they determine what is going on. No one is down here naming

States, saying all this awful stuff is going on in States. We have just got this scenario factory out here unwinding where people are saying, "This is the scenario where it is possible it could happen," but no one is giving us any indication of how it could possibly happen.

I think we all know about medical malpractice, and States and clinics and everybody are terribly careful about the control they have and about what kind of information they are putting out. I think that the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] has the right approach to this. It should be in the States that oversee the clinics and oversee the licensing and oversee what is going on. They are the ones that are monitoring it. To have one level being monitored by the States and then the Feds coming in for another part of it makes no sense.

Second, if we cannot use paraprofessionals for any area where we need bilingual interpretation, we could have all sorts of problems in how we would implement the law if we were to change it from what the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] is trying to do.

I really encourage people to move forward on this, to finally get this issue behind us, and to strongly vote for the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I yielded to him.

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, to establish the intent of this House on the gentleman's amendment, could the gentleman explain to me what would happen on his intent if the State law does not speak to the qualifications of these health care providers?

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman, if the DeLay amendment is adopted with the Waxman amendment to it, all those professionals spelled out in the amendment of the gentleman from Texas would be eligible to give counseling at a title X clinic.

If a State did not allow others to participate as counselors, then that State would not have addressed the matter. The Secretary would be required further to spell out through regulations additional individuals who could give information at these title X clinics, and that would be the full extent of the law in terms of how it would operate in title X clinics for counseling purposes.

Mr. DELAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WAXMAN. If the gentleman understands that, perhaps he would be agreeable to it. I cannot see what objection he would have to either States deciding on their own to add qualified people to give counseling or the Secretary to make that determination.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I still think it is rather confusing. If the gentleman would rewrite it, I might even accept it. I appreciate the gentleman establishing the intent, but I am not sure the courts will see it that way.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, if I can reclaim my time, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] is not on our committee. This issue has never come up on the subcommittee or the full committee. We have not had any contact from him to try to work out an amendment.

The gentleman has offered an amendment which he did not understand, from his own explanation, because he did not understand it was limited to counselors alone. He may not even realize that it excludes a lot of paraprofessionals and others who are quite competent to do this job. I think we ought to adopt this perfecting amendment, or otherwise to defeat the DeLay amendment, because I do not think it has been thought through what he is trying to accomplish, unless, unless it is to try to keep rural areas and inner city areas and short-funded family planning clinics from having people available to give counseling.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I thought this was a civil discussion, but the gentleman impugns my ability to read amendments and write amendments. This is absolutely untrue. We know what these specialists do. They do not just counsel, they even give medical exams. I understand that.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman, he is absolutely incorrect. The amendment does not address anybody but those giving counseling.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, they do other functions besides just giving counseling. We all understand that. We know how Planned Parenthood works.

Mr. WAXMAN. I would say to the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, the amendment addresses only counseling.

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman will yield further, the issue is we, even in this country, require Federal inspection of meat, but we do not care what the qualifications are of people that counsel teenage women on their reproductive options.

Mr. WAXMAN. What the gentleman is saying is that a State should not be able to determine that qualification, and I think a State should be able to. I think the Secretary ought to be able to deal with this as well.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of reauthorization of the Title X Program. Reauthorization of this bill is imperative as we are confronted with an increase in teen pregnancy, the AIDS epidemic, and an ongoing battle with sexually transmitted

diseases. Although this program has been funded through continuing appropriations, I believe this is a half-hearted approach to dealing with the devastating reality of these problems. Today we can change this. Mr. Chairman, we have a program before us designed to promote family planning and health care, especially among low-income women. This program must be authorized and legitimized to insure these services remain available, accessible, and affordable to women.

Title X funds over 4,000 clinics providing services to 4 million women. In addition to contraceptive services, family planning clinics provide health services and counseling to women who have nowhere else to go. In many cases these clinics are the only places low-income women can go to receive primary health care. Unfortunately, the issues surrounding reauthorization of the Title X Program have been constantly focused on the abortion debate. But there is much more to title X than this debate. How many people talk about how well-designed the program is to target low-income women and teenagers, the two groups at highest risk for poor pregnancy outcomes? How many people talk about the information these clinics put together to educate people about family planning? How many people talk about the preventive health services available to women at these clinics? What about screenings for cervical cancer and sexually transmitted diseases? Title X clinics should be applauded for their efforts to address all aspects of a women's health care needs. On a visit to a planned parenthood clinic in my hometown of Waterbury, CT, I was able to see the care and effort these professionals put into making their clinic accessible and supportive for women.

I do feel strongly, however, that parental involvement in the health decisions of minors who use these clinics is crucial to the effectiveness of these programs. These decisions are serious ones, ones that teenagers are often not able to deal with on their own. While the input of professionals is certainly quite valuable, nothing can equal the support and guidance that a parent can offer. The Government should be encouraging, rather than discouraging strong parental involvement in our children's lives and this is the best way of doing so. It is not our function to keep important information from parents regarding their children's health and well-being. The development of strong family units, with open communication will help in many cases to alleviate the problems these teenagers face.

Mr. Chairman, I feel we need to encourage and support family planning clinics, with an emphasis on the family, not obstruct and deter what is known to be a successful program of family planning and health care. It is time to reauthorize this program, the only major Federal program we have that goes directly to the need of family planning and avoiding unwanted pregnancies. Mr. Chairman, I support this bill, but more importantly I support the clinics and the women who will benefit from passage of this bill.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 670 which reauthorizes title X, the Nation's family planning program. I urge my colleagues to pass this important bill without any weakening amendments.

Approximately 4 million women are served by title X clinics in the United States each year, an average of over 10,000 women a day. For many of these women, the federally funded clinics are the only access they have to health care—including treatment, prevention, and education. This legislation would provide funding levels of \$238 million for fiscal year 1994 and \$270 million for fiscal year 1995.

This bill, which provides essential funding for title X clinics through 1995, also clarifies the language regarding abortion counseling and referrals. It specifies that federally funded clinics must provide nondirective advice on all pregnancy options. On his first day in office, President Clinton suspended the gag rule regulations which the Reagan and Bush administrations attempted to impose on the clinics. He also directed Secretary Shalala to rewrite the regulations to clarify the law. I applaud his efforts to swiftly revoke this harmful regulation. We must now clarify in statute the language regarding abortion counseling and referrals, so that this may never be an issue for the women of this country again.

As we vote to permanently revoke the gag rule, we must also oppose the Billey amendment which requires parental notification and a 48-hour waiting period for minors. There is no judicial bypass and it includes only two minor exceptions. One, if the minors' life is in imminent danger. Serious health problems would not be considered. And second, if the pregnancy is due to incest with the father or legal guardian, incest by an uncle, brother, or grandfather is not included.

The issue here is a fundamental one of fairness. The Billey amendment restricts only poor teenagers' access to health care options because it applies solely to minors who receive their health care in federally funded clinics. Health care options must not be determined by economics and age. Oppose Billey and let individual States decide their own laws on minors.

Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, oppose the Billey amendment, and protect all women's right to choice including the rights of teenagers girls.

Mr. MFUME. Madam Chairman, Mr. Speaker, today we vote on legislation that has ramifications for millions of poor women across the country. Not only do we have the opportunity to reauthorize the Title X Family Planning Program, we also have the opportunity to rectify a policy that has, for almost 5 years, effectively denied low-income women access to critical medical advice.

The prohibition on Federal funds to title X clinics offering complete pregnancy management counseling has resulted in dangerous restrictions on dissemination of medical information. Formerly, such counseling may only have been made if the mother's life was in imminent danger. But if the woman's health was threatened—that is, if she has medical conditions that could be aggravated by a pregnancy—she was still denied access to information that was vital to her health and well-being.

Already the Clinton administration has demonstrated its commitment to improved family planning services by suspending the "gag rule" regulations and instructing title X clinics to resume counseling on all options for dealing

with a pregnancy. Let us follow President Clinton's example and bring down the barriers that now exist for equal access to the counseling that women who can afford private health care take for granted.

Access to complete medical advice and threats to a mother's life are not the only issues at stake today. The United States has one of the industrial world's highest teenage pregnancy and childbearing rates. Teenagers are most likely to use the services of federally funded family planning clinics and are most at risk for problem pregnancies. Yet we have chosen to deny the clinics they use from providing abortion counseling or referrals.

Another political battle that has arisen to dilute this bill surrounds the issue of parental notification and States' rights. States should reserve the right to enact reasonable parental notification or consent requirements. Many already have laws in place—laws that would be undermined by a Federal standard.

By imposing a Federal standard on parental notification, Congress would be dictating to States stricter regulations than any now in force.

We cannot shirk from our responsibilities to this population and let politics interfere with the policies surrounding reproductive health care. The right to make individual decisions should not be impeded by antiabortion politics. Let us enable our doctors to provide the critical medical advice the "gag rule" has prohibited them from offering their indigent patients.

We must establish greater equality in the realm of public health and in the medical information made available to low-income citizens. It is imperative that we not exclude counseling for those who rely on public clinics because they can afford no other source of medical care. Today we have the opportunity to remedy the misdirected policies that "gagged" our physicians and have denied many their right to complete information with regard to pregnancy management.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 94]

Abercrombie	Dicks	Johnson (SD)	Oliver	Rush	Talent	Dingell	Klein	Price (NC)
Ackerman	Dingell	Johnson, E.B.	Ortiz	Sabo	Tanner	Dixon	Klug	Pryce (OH)
Allard	Dixon	Johnson, Sam	Orton	Sanders	Tauzin	Doooley	Kolbe	Ramstad
Andrews (ME)	Dooley	Johnston	Owens	Sangmeister	Taylor (MS)	Durbin	Kopetski	Rangel
Andrews (NJ)	Dornan	Kanjorski	Oxley	Santorium	Taylor (NC)	Edwards (CA)	Kreidler	Reed
Andrews (TX)	Duncan	Kaptur	Packard	Sarpalius	Tejeda	Edwards (TX)	Lambert	Regula
Applegate	Dunn	Kasich	Pallone	Sawyer	Thomas (CA)	Engel	Lancaster	Reynolds
Archer	Durbin	Kennedy	Parker	Saxton	Thomas (WY)	English (AZ)	Lantos	Richardson
Army	Edwards (TX)	Kennelly	Pastor	Schaefer	Thornton	Eshoo	LaRocco	Ridge
Bacchus (FL)	Emerson	Kildee	Paxon	Schenk	Thurman	Evans	Laughlin	Rose
Bachus (AL)	Engel	Kim	Payne (NJ)	Schiff	Torkildsen	Faleomavaega	Lazio	Rostenkowski
Baessler	English (AZ)	King	Payne (VA)	Schroeder	Torres	(AS)	Leach	Rowland
Baker (CA)	English (OK)	Kingston	Pelosi	Schumer	Torricelli	Fawell	Lehman	Roybal-Allard
Baker (LA)	Eshoo	Klecza	Penny	Scott	Towns	Fazio	Levin	Rush
Ballenger	Evans	Kleczka	Peterson (FL)	Sensenbrenner	Trafficant	Fields (LA)	Lewis (GA)	Sabo
Barcia	Everett	Kreidler	Peterson (MN)	Serrano	Tucker	Filner	Lloyd	Sanders
Barlow	Ewing	Klind	Petri	Shaw	Unsold	Fingerhut	Long	Sangmeister
Barrett (NE)	Faleomavaega	Knollenberg	Pickett	Shays	Upton	Flake	Lowey	Sawyer
Barrett (WI)	(AS)	Kolbe	Pomero	Shepherd	Velázquez	Foglietta	Machtley	Schenk
Bartlett	Fawell	Kopetski	Porter	Shuster	Vento	Ford (MI)	Maloney	Schiff
Barton	Fazio	Kreidler	Poshard	Sisisky	Visclosky	Frank (MA)	Mann	Schroeder
Bateman	Fields (LA)	Kyl	Price (NC)	Skeek	Volkmer	Franks (CT)	Margolies-	Schumer
Becerra	Fields (TX)	LaFalce	Pryce (OH)	Skelton	Vucanovich	Franks (NJ)	Mezvisinsky	Scott
Beilenson	Filner	Lambert	Quinn	Slattery	Walker	Frost	Markey	Serrano
Bentley	Fingerhut	Lancaster	Rahall	Slaughter	Walsh	Furse	Martinez	Shays
Bereuter	Fish	Lantos	Ramstad	Smith (IA)	Washington	Gallo	Matsui	Shepherd
Berman	Flake	LaRocco	Rangel	Smith (MI)	Waters	Gejdenson	McCloskey	Sisisky
Bevill	Foglietta	Laughlin	Ravenel	Smith (NJ)	Watt	Gekas	McCurdy	Skaggs
Bilbray	Ford (MI)	Lazio	Reed	Smith (OR)	Waxman	Gephardt	McDermott	Slattery
Bilirakis	Fowler	Leach	Regula	Smith (TX)	Weldon	Gibbons	McHale	Slaughter
Bishop	Franks (CT)	Lehman	Reynolds	Snowe	Wheat	Gilchrist	McHugh	Smith (IA)
Blackwell	Franks (NJ)	Levin	Richardson	Solomon	Whitten	Gilman	McInnis	Snowe
Bliley	Frost	Levy	Ridge	Spence	Williams	Glickman	McKinney	Spratt
Blute	Furse	Lewis (CA)	Roberts	Spratt	Wilson	Gonzalez	McMillan	Stark
Boehlert	Gallegly	Lewis (GA)	Roemer	Stark	Wise	Gordon	Meehan	Stokes
Boehner	Gallo	Lightfoot	Rogers	Stearns	Wolf	Grandy	Menendez	Strickland
Bonilla	Gejdenson	Linder	Rohrbacher	Stenholm	Woolsey	Green	Meyers	Studds
Bonior	Gekas	Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen	Stokes	Wyden	Greenwood	Mfume	Swift
Borski	Gephardt	Lloyd	Rose	Strickland	Wynn	Gutierrez	Miller (CA)	Synar
Boucher	Gibbons	Long	Rostenkowski	Studds	Yates	Hamburg	Miller (FL)	Tanner
Brewster	Gilchrist	Lowey	Roth	Stump	Young (AK)	Hamilton	Mineta	Thornton
Brooks	Gillmor	Machtley	Roukema	Stupak	Young (FL)	Harman	Minge	Thurman
Browder	Gilman	Maloney	Rowland	Sundquist	Zeliff	Hastings	Mink	Torkildsen
Brown (CA)	Gingrich	Mann	Roybal-Allard	Swift	Zimmer	Hefner	Moakley	Torres
Brown (FL)	Glickman	Manton	Royce	Synar		Hilliard	Molinari	Torricelli
Brown (OH)	Gonzalez	Manzullo				Hinchey	Moran	Towns
Bryant	Goodlatte	Margolies-				Hoagland	Morella	Trafficant
Bunning	Goodling	Mezvisinsky				Hobson	Murphy	Tucker
Burton	Gordon	Markey				Hochbrueckner	Murtha	Unsold
Buyer	Goss	Martinez				Hoke	Nadler	Upton
Byrne	Grams	Matsui				Horn	Natcher	Valentine
Callahan	Grandy	Mazzoli				Houghton	Neal (MA)	Velázquez
Calvert	Green	McCandless				Hoyer	Neal (NC)	Vento
Camp	Greenwood	McCloskey				Huffington	Norton (DC)	Visclosky
Canady	Gunderson	McCollum				Hughes	Obey	Washington
Cantwell	Gutierrez	McCrery				Inslee	Olver	Waters
Cardin	Hall (OH)	McCurdy				Jacobs	Owens	Watt
Carr	Hall (TX)	McDade				Jefferson	Pallone	Waxman
Castle	Hamburg	McDermott				Johnson (CT)	Pastor	Wheat
Chapman	Hamilton	McHale				Johnson (GA)	Payne (NJ)	Williams
Clay	Hancock	McHugh				Johnson (SD)	Payne (VA)	Wilson
Clayton	Hansen	McInnis				Johnson, E.B.	Pelosi	Wise
Clement	Harman	McKeon				Johnston	Penny	Woolsey
Clinger	Hastert	McKinney				Kaptur	Peterson (FL)	Wyden
Clyburn	Hastings	McMillan				Kennedy	Pickett	Wynn
Coble	Hayes	McNulty				Kennelly	Pomero	Yates
Coleman	Hefley	Meehan				Kleczka	Porter	Zimmer
Collins (GA)	Hefner	Menendez						
Collins (IL)	Herger	Meyers						
Collins (MI)	Hilliard	Mfume						
Combest	Hinchey	Mica						
Condit	Hoagland	Michel						
Conyers	Hobson	Miller (CA)						
Cooper	Hochbrueckner	Miller (FL)						
Coppersmith	Hoekstra	Mineta						
Costello	Hoke	Minge						
Cox	Holden	Mink						
Coyne	Horn	Moakley						
Cramer	Houghton	Molinari						
Crane	Hoyer	Mollohan						
Crapo	Huffington	Montgomery						
Cunningham	Hughes	Moorhead						
Danner	Hunter	Moran						
Darden	Hutchinson	Morella						
De Lugo (VI)	Hutto	Murphy						
Deal	Hyde	Murtha						
DeFazio	Inglis	Myers						
DeLauro	Inhofe	Nadler						
DeLay	Inslee	Natcher						
Dellums	Istook	Neal (MA)						
Derrick	Jacobs	Neal (NC)						
Deutsch	Jefferson	Norton (DC)						
Diaz-Balart	Johnson (CT)	Nussle						
Dickey	Johnson (GA)	Oberstar						

□ 1657

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO). Four hundred sixteen Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DeLay] for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(c) of rule XXIII, the Chair announces that any recorded vote on the DeLay amendment, as amended, will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 258, noes 165, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

AYES—256

Abercrombie	Boucher	Collins (IL)	Ginger	Goodling
Ackerman	Brewster	Collins (MI)	Coble	Goss
Andrews (ME)	Brooks	Condit	Collins (GA)	Grams
Andrews (NJ)	Browder	Conyers	Combest	Gunderson
Andrews (TX)	Brown (CA)	Cooper	Costello	Hall (OH)
Bacchus (FL)	Brown (FL)	Coppersmith	Cox	Hall (TX)
Baessler	Brown (OH)	Coyne	Crane	Hancock
Barlow	Bryant	Cramer	Crapo	Hansen
Barrett (WI)	Buyer	Danner	Cunningham	Hastert
Becerra	Byrne	Darden	DeLay	Hayes
Beilenson	Cantwell	de la Garza	Diaz-Balart	Hefley
Berman	Cardin	de Lugo (VI)	Dickey	Herger
Bevill	Castle	Deal	Dorman	Hoekstra
Bilbray	Chapman	DeFazio	Duncan	Holden
Bishop	Clay	DeLauro	Dunn	Hunter
Blackwell	Clayton	Dellums	Emerson	Hutchinson
Boehlert	Clement	Derrick	English (OK)	Hutto
Bonilla	Clyburn	Deutsch	Ewing	Hyde
Bonior	Coleman	Dicks	Fields (TX)	Inglis
			Fish	Inhofe
			Fowler	Istook
			Gallegly	Johnson, Sam
			Gillmor	Kanjorski
			Gingrich	Kasich
			Goodlatte	Kildee
				Kim

NOES—165

King	Ortiz	Skelton	Dellums	Istook	Oberstar	Thomas (CA)	Valentine	Williams
Kingston	Orton	Smith (MI)	Derrick	Jacobs	Obey	Thomas (WY)	Velazquez	Wilson
Klinsk	Oxley	Smith (NJ)	Deutsch	Jefferson	Oliver	Thornton	Vento	Wise
Knollenberg	Packard	Smith (OR)	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (CT)	Ortiz	Thurman	Visclosky	Wolf
Kyl	Parker	Smith (TX)	Dickey	Johnson (GA)	Orton	Torkildsen	Voikmer	Woolsey
LaFalce	Paxon	Solomon	Dicks	Johnson (SD)	Owens	Torres	Walker	Wyden
Levy	Peterson (MN)	Spence	Dingell	Johnson, E.B.	Oxley	Torricelli	Walsh	Wynn
Lewis (CA)	Petri	Stearns	Dixon	Johnson, Sam	Packard	Towns	Washington	Yates
Lightfoot	Pombo	Stenholm	Dooley	Johnson	Pallone	Trafilant	Waters	Young (AK)
Linder	Poshard	Stump	Dornan	Kanjorski	Parker	Tucker	Waxman	Young (FL)
Lipinski	Quinn	Stupak	Duncan	Kapoor	Pastor	Underwood (GU)	Weldon	Zeliff
Livingston	Rahall	Sundquist	Dunn	Kasich	Paxon	Unsoeld	Wheat	Zimmer
Manton	Ravenel	Talent	Durbin	Kennedy	Payne (NJ)	Upton	Whitten	
Manzullo	Roberts	Tauzin	Edwards (CA)	Kennelly	Payne (VA)			
Mazzoli	Roemer	Taylor (MS)	Edwards (TX)	Kildee	Penlos			
McCandless	Rogers	Taylor (NC)	Emerson	Kim	Penny			
McCollum	Rohrabacher	Tejeda	Engel	King	Peterson (FL)	Allard	Michel	Solomon
McCrery	Ros-Lehtinen	Thomas (CA)	English (AZ)	Kingston	Peterson (MN)	Applegate	Myers	Tejeda
McDade	Roth	Thomas (WY)	English (OK)	Kloczka	Pickett	Army	Nussle	Vucanovich
McKeon	Roukema	Volkmer	Eshoo	Klein	Pommo	Ballenger	Roberts	Watt
McNulty	Royce	Vucanovich	Evans	Klink	Pomeroy	Bunning	Shuster	
Mica	Santorium	Walker	Everett	Klug	Porter	Costello	Smith (OR)	
Michel	Sarpallius	Walsh	Ewing	Knollenberg	Poshard			
Mollohan	Saxton	Weldon	Faleomavaega	Kolbe	Price (NC)	Doolittle	Henry	Quillen
Montgomery	Schaefer	Whitten	(AS)	Kopetski	Pryce (OH)	Dreier	Lewis (FL)	Romero-Barcelo
Moorhead	Sensenbrenner	Wolf	Fawell	Kreidler	Quinn	Ford (MI)	Meek	(PR)
Myers	Shaw	Young (AK)	Fazio	Kyl	Rahall	Ford (TN)	Pickle	Sharp
Nussle	Shuster	Young (FL)	Fields (LA)	LaFalce	Ramstad			
Oberstar	Skeen	Zeliff	Fields (TX)	Lambert	Rangel			
			Filner	Lancaster	Ravenel			
			Fingerhut	Lantos	Reed			
			Fish	LaRocco	Regula			
			Flake	Laughlin	Reynolds			
			Foglietta	Lazio	Richardson			
			Fowler	Leach	Ridge			
			Frank (MA)	Lehman	Roemer			
			Franks (CT)	Levin	Rogers			
			Franks (NJ)	Levy	Rohrabacher			
			Frost	Lewis (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen			
			Furse	Lewis (GA)	Rose			
			Gallegly	Lightfoot	Rostenkowski			
			Gallo	Linder	Roth			
			Gedjenson	Lipinski	Roukema			
			Gekas	Livingston	Rowland			
			Gephardt	Lloyd	Royal-Allard			
			Geren	Long	Royce			
			Gibbons	Lowey	Rush			
			Gilchrest	Machtley	Sabo			
			Gillmor	Maloney	Sanders			
			Gilman	Mann	Sangmeister			
			Gingrich	Manton	Santorium			
			Glickman	Manzullo	Sarpallius			
			Gonzalez	Margolies	Sawyer			
			Goodlatte	Mezvisinsky	Saxton			
			Goodling	Markey	Schaefer			
			Gordon	Martinez	Schenk			
			Goss	Matsui	Schiff			
			Grams	Mazzoli	Schroeder			
			Grandy	McCandless	Schumer			
			Green	McCloskey	Scott			
			Greenwood	McCollum	Sensenbrenner			
			Gunderson	McCrery	Serrano			
			Gutierrez	McCurdy	Shaw			
			Hall (OH)	McDade	Shays			
			Hall (TX)	McDermott	Shepherd			
			Hamburg	McHale	Sisisky			
			Hamilton	McHugh	Skaggs			
			Hancock	McInnis	Skeen			
			Hansen	McKeon	Skelton			
			Harman	McKinney	Slatery			
			Hastert	McMillan	Slaughter			
			Hastings	McNulty	Smith (IA)			
			Hayes	Meehan	Smith (MI)			
			Hefley	Menendez	Smith (NJ)			
			Hefner	Meyers	Smith (TX)			
			Herger	Mfume	Snowe			
			Hilliard	Mica	Spence			
			Hinchey	Miller (CA)	Spratt			
			Hoagland	Miller (FL)	Stark			
			Hobson	Mineta	Stearns			
			Hochbrueckner	Minge	Stenholm			
			Hoekstra	Mink	Stokes			
			Hoke	Moakley	Strickland			
			Holden	Mollinari	Studds			
			Horn	Mollohan	Stump			
			Houghton	Montgomery	Sundquist			
			Hoyer	Moorhead	Swett			
			Huffington	Moran	Swift			
			Hughes	Morella	Synar			
			Hunter	Murphy	Talent			
			Hutchinson	Murtha	Tanner			
			Hutto	Nadler	Tauzin			
			Hyde	Natcher	Taylor (MS)			
			Inglis	Neal (MA)	Taylor (NC)			
			Inhofe	Neal (NC)				
			Inslee	Norton (DC)				

NOT VOTING—14

Carr	Henry	Romero-Barcelo
Doolittle	Lewis (FL)	(PR)
Dreier	Meek	Sharp
Ford (TN)	Pickle	Swett
Geren	Quillen	Underwood (GU)

□ 1707

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], as amended.

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO). This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 408, noes 16, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 96]

AYES—408

Abercrombie	Bliley	Clayton
Ackerman	Blute	Clement
Andrews (ME)	Boehlert	Clinger
Andrews (NJ)	Boehner	Clyburn
Andrews (TX)	Bonilla	Coble
Archer	Bonior	Coleman
Bacchus (FL)	Borski	Collins (GA)
Bacchus (AL)	Boucher	Collins (IL)
Baesler	Brewster	Collins (MI)
Baker (CA)	Brooks	Combest
Baker (LA)	Browder	Condit
Barcia	Brown (CA)	Conyers
Barlow	Brown (FL)	Cooper
Barrett (NE)	Brown (OH)	Coppersmith
Barrett (WI)	Bryant	Cox
Bartlett	Burton	Coyne
Barton	Buyer	Cramer
Bateman	Byrne	Crane
Becerra	Callahan	Crapo
Benenson	Calvert	Cunningham
Bentley	Camp	Danner
Bereuter	Canady	Darden
Berman	Cantwell	de la Garza
Bevill	Cardin	de Lugo (VI)
Bilbray	Carr	Deal
Bilirakis	Castle	DeFazio
Bishop	Chapman	DeLauro
Blackwell	Clay	DeLay

NOES—16

Allard	Michel	Solomon
Applegate	Myers	Tejeda
Army	Nussle	Vucanovich
Ballenger	Roberts	Watt
Bunning	Shuster	
Costello	Smith (OR)	

NOT VOTING—11

Doolittle	Henry	Quillen
Dreier	Lewis (FL)	Romero-Barcelo
Ford (MI)	Meek	(PR)
Ford (TN)	Pickle	Sharp

□ 1716

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. CRANE, Ms. DUNN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 103-41.

For what purpose does the gentleman from California rise?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WAXMAN: Page 3, strike lines 1 through 5 and insert the following:

"(B) the project refers the individual seeking services to another provider in the project, or to another project in the geographic area involved, as the case may be, that will provide such information.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chairman, H.R. 670 contains language regarding the issues that are commonly called the conscience clause. This provision was offered last year as an amendment by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], and was adopted overwhelmingly at that time.

The provision allows an individual doctor or nurse to decline to provide information about pregnancy management options—including abortion—if to do so would violate the doctor or nurse's moral convictions. It also allows a project receiving grant support to decline to provide such information.

The provision also requires that the project receiving the grant support refer a woman to another project that will answer her questions.

My amendment clarifies the provisions in the bill.

The current bill language could be interpreted to require individual doctors and nurses personally to refer patients to other sources of information.

My amendment makes it clear that this is a responsibility of the project receiving grant support—not each individual in that project—and that the project must make a referral.

This is the right balance.

No one is asking individuals to provide counseling—even nondirective, informational counseling—if it violates their principles to do so.

But we are saying that when a pregnant woman asks for information, she can get the information she needs.

Madam Chairman, I urge an "aye" vote for the amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I am very pleased that the original bill recognized the need for a conscience clause, but regrettably, the language of the original bill does not provide a conscience clause which is acceptable.

The language of the original bill required that someone offering counseling would have to refer the individual to someone who would talk to them about abortion. There are many people in the country who cannot do this.

□ 1720

The language of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] corrects the problem somewhat in that it now removes the obligation from the person who counseled, but it still places an obligation on the institution, on the organization, to refer to another institution, or organization, or clinic that will provide the counseling. This will disenfranchise many organizations, many clinics, across the country where everyone in the clinic is opposed to abortion and yet, from a compassionate viewpoint, they genuinely want to help these women.

Madam Chairman, I would submit that there is not probably a single woman in the United States who does not know that abortion is an option. Someone does not need to tell them that an abortion is an option. I object to language that would require the individual or the organization to refer this woman or this young woman to another organization where this kind of counseling for abortion would be provided.

Whether I were pro-life or whether I were pro-choice, Madam Chairman, as a matter of compassion and as a matter of fairness I would support removing

the language from the bill, and we would do no violation to the intent of this bill. It is a very simple bill, and I say to my colleagues, "If you remove this language from it, we do not need to substitute language of the Waxman amendment. My amendment, which can be voted on if we vote this amendment down simply removes the offending language from page 3, the first five lines of page 3."

Madam Chairman, this is a very simple procedure. It now brings the conscience clause into what most people would feel was a true conscience clause. That was the intent of the bill. All that I ask my colleagues to do is please vote down this amendment and then vote yes for my amendment which would make this a true conscience clause.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chairman, I wish to respond to the gentleman's statement, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, first of all I am pleased that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT] recognizes that this amendment does clarify the conscience of individuals who do not want to personally give information that they feel is inconsistent with their beliefs, but this clarification, I think, is all that is needed. If we go further, Madam Chairman, what we would be saying is that a woman who wanted to get counseling would not be able to go anywhere. She would not be told where to go. Even though an individual may not want to give that information and counseling, that individual should refer to someone else in the program who does not have this disability in terms of giving this counseling that she is requesting, or refusal, and if there is no one in the plan there, she ought to be referred somewhere else to get the information. If they are going to get Federal funds, individuals who get the Federal funds, individuals who work in the plans who get Federal funds, should not have to violate their consciences, and that is what the purpose of this amendment is all about, and I think this clarification is very much needed.

Madam Chairman, I would urge an aye vote.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, an extremely dangerous precedent will be set if the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] is enacted forcing all title X family planning projects to refer for abortions. Under the chairman's amendment, federally funded family planning projects, comprised of doctors, nurses and counselors of conscience, who collectively oppose facili-

tating the demise of infant children, will either lose their Federal funds or if they buckle under the pressure will acquiesce to financial coercion and refer for abortions.

Mr. WAXMAN argues that his amendment is a conscience clause but it utterly fails to protect family planning projects which are nothing more than groups of people in complicity in abortion.

To illustrate: If a woman works at a title X clinic and she and her colleagues refuse to refer for abortions because they recognize the fact that these procedures kill baby girls and boys by dismembering their fragile bodies or because they are repelled by poisons routinely employed by the abortionist that chemically burn and disfigure the baby, under the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN], if they conscientiously object to abortion, they are no longer eligible for Federal aid. Forcing their title X clinic to have an abortion counselor or counselors makes them an accessory to the killing of babies, and no neat, little, tidy rationalization that they only referred to someone else who then made the referral does in no way lessen their involvement.

Madam Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] is not a conscience clause for groups of people. It compels, it forces title X projects to refer for abortions, so let us not kid ourselves on that score.

Madam Chairman, I urge its defeat. I urge it so that we can then get to the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT] which gets on to this floor for consideration by this body, a genuine, authentic conscience clause.

Mr. BARLETT of Maryland. Madam Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Madam Chairman, this is another one of those parliamentary moves where a reasonable person coming on this floor, believing in the individual rights of conscience, would say about the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN]: "Well, this looks pretty reasonable. How can I possibly vote against this?"

Yet, Madam Chairman, it precludes a vote of the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT] which is a true conscience amendment vote.

I say to my colleagues, "If you don't think we have a conscience problem with abortion, may I announce to this Chamber that for the first time a doctor cannot be found in the U.S. military, in all the branches, anywhere in the world, willing to do abortions, except one, and at the base his anesthesiologist said, 'Not me, Jocko. Count

me out. Find yourself somebody else to administer the anesthesia."

So, right now, until we recruit abortion doctors for the Navy, the Air Force, or Army, we have a real conscience problem under our brand-new, first ever in two centuries and 16-some years, a full-on, abortion-for-all-9-months-for-any-reason President. We have got our first abortion President, and as a result, my colleagues, we are going to have conscience problems all over this country.

Now we cannot force a crisis pregnancy center counselor who believes that there is a human life in the womb to tell a pregnant woman, "Go down to the far cubicle, because I have," what the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] called, "a disability in counseling on killing." He inadvertently, and I know he did not mean to do it, but the gentleman from California called it a disability. "If I don't gag, I have to say 'kill your baby.' We have just listened to the sonogram. We heard that sound that sounds like 'Wow' under the water; 'Wow, Wow, Wow, Wow, Wow, Wow.' 120 beats a minute. Let us kill that baby."

"I cannot bring myself to say that, so because of my 'disability,' go to cubicle 3-C, where we've got this volunteer honcho out there, a teenager, and she'll tell you how to do it."

Madam Chairman, we have got to have a substantive amendment here that allows for conscience which I think every man and woman of conscience in this great deliberative body would like to give to people who truly believe this is killing.

When I got here 17 years ago, Madam Chairman, it had been 15 years since my wife had had life inside of her, our youngest. That youngest, Kathleen, is now 7 months pregnant. I have gone through nine pregnancies, with my daughter-in-law and three daughters, during this last 15 years. I put my hand on those pregnant bellies and listened with the help of sonograms.

We are dealing with human life here. Respect the consciences of those who will not kill.

□ 1730

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, this is an extremely difficult issue for many people, but one thing ought to be easy, and that is respecting somebody's conscience. I do not think your conscience is mortgaged to anybody. It ought to remain inviolable. People who have moral scruples about abortion, about being an accessory to abortion, about advancing or furthering the cause of exterminating unborn children, the sensitivity, indeed, the sanctity of their conscience, ought to be respected.

The gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] does indirectly what the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT] wishes and seeks to prevent indirectly. It is a distinction without a difference. It is accomplishing the same purpose, namely, a referral for abortion, and it does contravene the conscience of someone who is opposed to this sort of action.

Madam Chairman, I plead with Members as they march forward into this new abortion era that we seem to be entering, respect the consciences of those who feel deeply and morally about this question, defeat the Waxman amendment, and permit the Bartlett amendment to be presented and hopefully adopted.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Madam Chairman, I do not think that there is a single person in the United States but what would hope that we could resolve the problems of unfortunate women who have a pregnancy they do not want by some means other than abortion. There are many, many clinics across the country that would seek to counsel women to this end. If we do not vote down this amendment and vote mine in, these clinics will not be able to function.

Madam Chairman, I ask Members to please vote down the Waxman amendment. Make it possible to vote a true conscience clause. The one thing that distinguishes our society and our country from every other society essentially and every other country in the world is the fairness and compassion that marks our society. Please recognize that in this vote. Vote down the Waxman amendment and then vote up the Bartlett amendment.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I want to clarify what this amendment is all about. This amendment states clearly that if someone finds it objectionable to his or her conscience to advise or counsel on abortion, that that individual not be required to participate in that counseling. That is a way to deal with those who have a definite conscientious objection to abortion and not to require them to do something that is inconsistent with their moral values.

This amendment also says that a woman can still get the information. If the Bartlett amendment were adopted, we would have the gag rule reincarnated, because a clinic would then be able to say, "Well, no one here wants to tell a woman where she could get that information, and therefore she will not even be referred to those who can give her the information she wants, the actual true full facts that she is entitled to," because a clinic is receiving Federal dollars and they ought to be able to give her at least a

referral to someone who can give her the information she wants and the truth. So we would through this amendment permit those who have conscientious objections to participating, to opt out and not participate in counseling, and I urge that this conscience amendment be adopted. I ask for an aye vote for the amendment.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 260, noes 163, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]

AYES—260

Abercrombie	Durbin	Johnson, E.B.
Ackerman	Edwards (CA)	Kaptur
Andrews (ME)	Edwards (TX)	Kennedy
Andrews (NJ)	Engel	Kennelly
Andrews (TX)	English (AZ)	Kleccka
Bacchus (FL)	Eshoo	Klein
Baessler	Evans	Klug
Barlow	Faleomavaega	Kolbe
Barrett (WI)	(AS)	Kopetski
Becerra	Fawell	Kreidler
Beilenson	Fazio	Lambert
Berman	Fields (LA)	Lancaster
Bevill	Filner	Lantos
Bilbray	Fingerhut	LaRocco
Bishop	Flake	Laughlin
Blackwell	Foglietta	Lazio
Boehlert	Ford (MI)	Leach
Bonilla	Fowler	Lehman
Bonior	Frank (MA)	Levin
Boucher	Franks (CT)	Levy
Brewster	Franks (NJ)	Lewis (CA)
Brooks	Frost	Lewis (GA)
Browder	Furse	Lloyd
Brown (CA)	Gallo	Long
Brown (FL)	Gejdenson	Lowe
Brown (OH)	Gekas	Machtley
Bryant	Gephardt	Maloney
Byrne	Geren	Mann
Calvert	Gibbons	Margolies-
Cantwell	Gilchrist	Mezvinisky
Cardin	Gilman	Markey
Carr	Glickman	Martinez
Castle	Gonzalez	Matsui
Chapman	Gordon	McCloskey
Clay	Grandy	McCurdy
Clayton	Green	McDermott
Clement	Greenwood	McHale
Clinger	Gunderson	McHugh
Clyburn	Gutierrez	McInnis
Coleman	Hamburg	McKinney
Collins (IL)	Hamilton	McMillan
Collins (MI)	Harman	Meehan
Condit	Hastings	Meek
Cooper	Hefner	Menendez
Coppersmith	Hilliard	Meyers
Coyne	Hinchey	Mfume
Cramer	Hoagland	Miller (CA)
Danner	Hobson	Miller (FL)
Darden	Hochbrueckner	Mineta
de Lugo (VI)	Hoke	Minge
Deal	Horn	Mink
DeFazio	Houghton	Moakley
DeLauro	Hoyer	Molinari
Dellums	Huffington	Moran
Derrick	Hughes	Morella
Deutsch	Inslee	Nadler
Dicks	Jacobs	Natcher
Dingell	Jefferson	Neal (MA)
Dixon	Johnson (CT)	Neal (NC)
Dooley	Johnson (GA)	Norton (DC)
Dunn	Johnson (SD)	Obey

Oliver	Sawyer	Torres
Owens	Schenk	Torricelli
Pallone	Schiff	Towns
Pastor	Schroeder	Trafficant
Payne (NJ)	Schumer	Tucker
Payne (VA)	Scott	Underwood (GU)
Pelosi	Serrano	Unsoeld
Peterson (FL)	Shays	Upton
Pickett	Shepherd	Valentine
Pomeroy	Sisisky	Velaquez
Porter	Skaggs	Vento
Price (NC)	Slattery	Washington
Pryce (OH)	Slaughter	Waters
Ramstad	Smith (IA)	Watt
Rangel	Snowe	Waxman
Reed	Spratt	Wheat
Reynolds	Stark	Williams
Richardson	Stokes	Wilson
Ridge	Strickland	Wise
Rose	Studds	Woolsey
Rostenkowski	Sweet	Wyden
Roukema	Swift	Wynn
Rowland	Synar	Yates
Roybal-Allard	Thomas (CA)	Zeliff
Rush	Thornton	Zimmer
Sabo	Thurman	
Sanders	Torkildsen	

NOES—163

Allard	Hancock	Penny
Applegate	Hansen	Peterson (MN)
Archer	Hastert	Petri
Armey	Hayes	Pombo
Bachus (AL)	Hefley	Poshard
Baker (CA)	Herger	Quinn
Baker (LA)	Hoekstra	Rahall
Ballenger	Holden	Ravenel
Barcia	Hunter	Regula
Barrett (NE)	Hutchinson	Roberts
Bartlett	Hutto	Roemer
Barton	Hyde	Rogers
Bateman	Inglis	Rohrabacher
Bentley	Inhofe	Ros-Lehtinen
Bereuter	Istook	Roth
Bilirakis	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Billiey	Kanjorski	Sangmeister
Blute	Kasich	Santorum
Boehner	Kildee	Sarpallius
Borski	Kim	Saxton
Bunning	King	Schaefer
Burton	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Buyer	Klink	Shaw
Callahan	Knollenberg	Shuster
Camp	Kyl	Skeen
Canady	LaFalce	Skelton
Coble	Lightfoot	Smith (MI)
Collins (GA)	Linder	Smith (NJ)
Combest	Lipinski	Smith (OR)
Costello	Livingston	Smith (TX)
Cox	Manton	Solomon
Crane	Manzullo	Spence
Crapo	Mazzoli	Stearns
Cunningham	McCandless	Stump
de la Garza	McCollum	Stupak
DeLay	McCrery	Sundquist
Diaz-Balart	McDade	Talent
Dickey	McKeon	Tanner
Dorman	McNulty	Tauzin
Duncan	Mica	Tauzin
Emerson	Michel	Taylor (MS)
English (OK)	Mollohan	Taylor (NC)
Everett	Montgomery	Tejeda
Ewing	Moorhead	Thomas (WY)
Fields (TX)	Murphy	Volkmer
Fish	Murtha	Vucanovich
Gallely	Myers	Walker
Gillmor	Nussle	Walsh
Gingrich	Oberstar	Weldon
Goodlatte	Ortiz	Whitten
Goodling	Orton	Wolf
Goss	Oxley	Young (AK)
Grams	Packard	Young (FL)
Hall (OH)	Parker	
Hall (TX)	Paxon	

NOT VOTING—12

Conyers	Johnston	Romero-Barcelo
Doolittle	Lewis (FL)	(PR)
Dreier	Pickle	Sharp
Ford (TN)	Quillen	Visclosky
Henry		

□ 1756

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion to rise offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 287, noes 119, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 98]

AYES—287

Abercrombie	Edwards (TX)	Kopetski
Ackerman	Engel	Kreidler
Andrews (ME)	English (AZ)	LaFalce
Andrews (NJ)	English (OK)	Lancaster
Andrews (TX)	Eshoo	Lantos
Applegate	Evans	LaRocco
Archer	Ewing	Laughlin
Bacchus (FL)	Fazio	Lehman
Baessler	Fields (LA)	Levin
Barcia	Filner	Lewis (GA)
Barlow	Fingerhut	Lipinski
Barrett (WI)	Fish	Lloyd
Barton	Flake	Long
Bateman	Foglietta	Lowey
Becerra	Ford (MI)	Machtley
Beilenson	Frank (MA)	Maloney
Bentley	Franks (NJ)	Mann
Bevill	Frost	Margolies-
Bilbray	Furse	Mezvisinsky
Bishop	Gedensson	Markay
Blackwell	Gephardt	Martinez
Boehert	Geren	Matsui
Bonior	Gibbons	Mazzoli
Borski	Gilman	McCloskey
Boucher	Glickman	McCollum
Brewster	Gonzalez	McCurdy
Brooks	Goodlatte	McDade
Browder	Goodling	McDermott
Brown (CA)	Gordon	McHale
Brown (FL)	Green	McKinney
Brown (OH)	Gutierrez	McNulty
Bryant	Hall (OH)	Meehan
Byrne	Hall (TX)	Meek
Callahan	Hamburg	Menendez
Calvert	Hamilton	Mfume
Cantwell	Hansen	Mica
Cardin	Harman	Mineta
Carr	Hastings	Minge
Castle	Hayes	Moakley
Clay	Hefley	Mollohan
Clayton	Hilliard	Montgomery
Clement	Hinchey	Moran
Clinger	Hoagland	Morella
Clyburn	Hochbrueckner	Murtha
Coleman	Hoke	Nadler
Collins (IL)	Holden	Natcher
Collins (MI)	Hoyer	Neal (MA)
Condit	Hughes	Neal (NC)
Conyers	Hutto	Norton (DC)
Cooper	Hyde	Oberstar
Coppersmith	Inslee	Obey
Costello	Istook	Oliver
Coyne	Jacobs	Ortiz
Cramer	Jefferson	Orton
Danner	Johnson (CT)	Owens
Darden	Johnson (GA)	Oxley
de la Garza	Johnson (SD)	Pallone
de Lugo (VI)	Johnson, E.B.	Parker
Deal	Johnson, Sam	Pastor
DeFazio	Johnston	Payne (NJ)
DeLauro	Kanjorski	Payne (VA)
Dellums	Kaptur	Pelosi
Derrick	Kennedy	Penny
Deutsch	Kennelly	Peterson (FL)
Dicks	Kildee	Peterson (MN)
Dingell	Kim	Pickett
Dixon	Kleczka	Pomeroy
Dooley	Klein	Porter
Durbin	Klink	Poshard
Edwards (CA)	Kolbe	Price (NC)

Rahall	Shaw	Tejeda
Rangel	Shays	Thomas (CA)
Ravenel	Shepherd	Thornton
Reed	Shuster	Thurman
Reynolds	Sisisky	Torres
Richardson	Skaggs	Torricelli
Ridge	Skeen	Towns
Roemer	Skelton	Trafficant
Rogers	Slattery	Underwood (GU)
Rose	Slaughter	Unsoeld
Rostenkowski	Smith (IA)	Valentine
Rowland	Spratt	Velaquez
Roybal-Allard	Stenholm	Vento
Rush	Stokes	Volkmer
Sabo	Strickland	Walsh
Sanders	Studds	Washington
Sangmeister	Stupak	Waters
Sarpallius	Sundquist	Watt
Sawyer	Sweet	Waxman
Saxton	Swift	Wheat
Schenk	Synar	Wilson
Schiff	Talent	Wise
Schroeder	Tanner	Woolsey
Schumer	Tauzin	Wyden
Scott	Taylor (MS)	Wynn
Serrano	Taylor (NC)	Zeliff

NOES—119

Allard	Gingrich	Molinari
Bachus (AL)	Goss	Moorhead
Baker (CA)	Grams	Myers
Baker (LA)	Grandy	Nussle
Ballenger	Greenwood	Packard
Barrett (NE)	Gunderson	Paxon
Bartlett	Hancock	Petri
Bereuter	Hastert	Pombo
Bilirakis	Herger	Pryce (OH)
Billiey	Hobson	Quinn
Blute	Hoekstra	Ramstad
Boehner	Horn	Regula
Bonilla	Houghton	Roberts
Bunning	Huffington	Rohrabacher
Burton	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Buyer	Hutchinson	Roth
Camp	Inglis	Roukema
Canady	Inhofe	Royce
Coble	King	Santorum
Collins (GA)	Kingston	Schaefer
Crane	Klug	Sensenbrenner
Crapo	Knollenberg	Smith (MI)
Cunningham	Kyl	Smith (NJ)
DeLay	Lazio	Smith (OR)
Diaz-Balart	Leach	Smith (TX)
Dickey	Levy	Snowe
Dorman	Lewis (CA)	Solomon
Duncan	Lightfoot	Spence
Dunn	Linder	Stearns
Emerson	Livingston	Stump
Everett	Manzullo	Thomas (WY)
Fawell	McCandless	Torkildsen
Fields (TX)	McCrery	Upton
Fowler	McHugh	Vucanovich
Franks (CT)	McInnis	Walker
Gallely	McKeon	Weldon
Gallo	McMillan	Wolf
Gekas	Meyers	Young (AK)
Gilchrist	Michel	Zimmer
Gillmor	Miller (FL)	

NOT VOTING—29

Armey	Henry	Romero-Barcelo
Berman	Kasich	(PR)
Chapman	Lambert	Sharp
Combest	Lewis (FL)	Stark
Cox	Manton	Tucker
Doolittle	Miller (CA)	Visclosky
Dreier	Mink	Whitten
Faleomavaega	Murphy	Williams
(AS)	Pickle	Yates
Ford (TN)	Quillen	Young (FL)
Hefner		

□ 1817

Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mrs. ROUKEMA changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. MAZZOLI changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to rise was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. HOYER]

having assumed the chair, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 670) to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to ensure that pregnant women receiving assistance under title X of the Public Health Service Act are provided with information and counseling regarding their pregnancies, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ME-TOO DRUGS OFFER SAVINGS

(Mr. SUNDQUIST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw this Chamber's attention to the sad, and very nearly tragic, mistreatment of a Democratic former Member of the House of Representatives.

A long time ago, someone counted up how much the chemicals and other substances that make up the human body were worth. The total came to 98 cents. Well, it may be time to update that figure. Based on the medical treatment Defense Secretary Aspin received from military doctors, we now know that a Defense Secretary is not even worth a buck fifty-five.

Now, I mean no disrespect to the Secretary. A buck fifty-five is what the military health system saved by giving the Secretary a typhoid vaccine injection rather than a more expensive oral vaccine. The injection Secretary Aspin received resulted in a fever, which caused dehydration, which, in turn aggravated the Secretary's preexisting heart condition.

The costlier oral vaccine, which, I understand, was developed with military funds, has fewer side effects, and is routinely administered to U.S. soldiers sent to developing countries. I applaud this practice. Our fighting men and women are worth the additional cost. In fact, I wish the doctors treating the Secretary had come to me before giving him the shot; I would have gladly paid the buck fifty-five out of my own pocket to spare him the hospital stay.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you may be wondering why I am rising to the defense of a leader of the other party. You should, instead, be wondering why the Members of his own party have not noted and deplored this grave injustice. The reason may be that they fear being politically incorrect.

In recent years, it has become common practice for some Members of this body to inveigh against the way the pharmaceutical industry does business.

It has been alleged that drug prices are too high. Never mind that a recent study by the respected National Bu-

reau of Economic Research pointed out serious flaws in the data on which this allegation is based.

It has been alleged that drug company profits are too high. Never mind that a study by our own Office of Technology Assessment, while far from favorable to the industry, found that drug company profits are not far out of line with those in comparable industries.

It has also been alleged that drug companies spend too much time and money developing what are called me-too drugs. Now, for those of my colleagues who may not spend too much time following the pharmaceutical debate, let me make it clear what a me-too drug is. This is a drug that takes an existing formula and improves on it, perhaps by eliminating adverse side effects, by increasing the speed of action, or by making the active ingredient available in a form that is easier to use. The oral vaccine that probably would have saved Secretary Aspin in his stay in the hospital was just such a drug.

Those who deplore the money spent on me-too drugs would have drug companies spend all their time on developing break-through products. Would that they could. I do not know a single drug company CEO who would say, "Well, we could develop a cure for cancer or AIDS, but why not enter the crowded cold remedy market instead."

Many critics of the drug industry seem not to understand that scientific progress is incremental. I have spent some time with a number of scientists and university professors. I never saw any light bulbs go off over anyone's head as they got hit by a breakthrough idea. What I saw was lots of very smart people, making progress in small steps, picking problems they hoped they could solve, or make a contribution to solving. Scientific breakthroughs are really the culmination of many small steps, some of which may, originally, have been heading in an entirely different direction.

And breakthroughs are no good at all to the people who cannot benefit from them. Me-too drugs make these breakthroughs available to a broader range of people by eliminating certain side effects and, most importantly, by giving patients and their physicians a choice. That's what upsets me the most about the way the Secretary's doctors treated him—they had a choice, and they made the wrong one.

What could be even worse, however, is eliminating the choice entirely. Suppose scientists discover a cure for AIDS, or cancer, but it is not suitable to the needs of 20 to 30 percent of those who need it. This is the proportion of people who have adverse side effects from the injection from the Secretary was given. And suppose you are an AIDS or cancer patient in that 20 or 30 percent. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, I

would be shouting, "Me, too! I want to be helped!"

Mr. Speaker, I have here in my hand a buck fifty-five. I would like to donate it to the Defense Department to make sure that the next time the Secretary's doctors need to give him a typhoid shot, that they stop and give him the safer oral vaccine. At least in this case, there is a choice. Let us not be so eager to reform the drug industry that we eliminate choice for the rest of us.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to include extraneous matter, I include the following article from the New York Times of February 24, 1993, for reprinting in the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 24, 1993]

MILITARY GAVE ASPIN A RISKIER VACCINE

(By Eric Schmitt)

WASHINGTON, February 23.—Military doctors gave Defense Secretary Les Aspin a typhoid shot known to cause nausea and fever, aggravating a congenital heart condition, instead of a more expensive oral vaccine with fewer side effects, a senior Pentagon official said today.

"It's my understanding that the injection vaccine was used because it's cheaper than the oral one," said Mr. Aspin's spokesman, Vernon A. Guidry Jr. "That policy is now being reconsidered."

The cost to the Pentagon of a typhoid vaccine injection is 35 cents, and the immunization is effective for three years. The oral vaccine, which the Army helped develop, costs \$1.90 and is effective for five years. The costlier oral vaccine is routinely administered to soldiers bound for developing countries. Mr. Aspin was inoculated in preparation for a trip this weekend to Somalia; the trip has now been postponed.

Doctors said today that Mr. Aspin had "significantly improved" since Sunday, when he was placed in intensive care at Georgetown University Hospital after suffering breathing difficulties related to a mild heart condition. Pentagon officials said Mr. Aspin, who is 54, would probably remain hospitalized one more night for further tests and evaluation.

FULL RECOVERY EXPECTED

Pentagon doctors issued their first detailed statement on Mr. Aspin tonight. According to The Associated Press, the statement said that Mr. Aspin was not suffering from chest pains but that the thickness of his heart muscle had increased since he suffered heart problems in 1991.

The statement said that Mr. Aspin had occasionally skipped heartbeats but that they were not dangerous. The doctors said they expected a full recovery.

Mr. Aspin had been suffering from bronchitis, but his breathing problems resulted mainly from a typhoid inoculation that induced a fever and aggravated his heart problem, Pentagon officials said.

The cost of Mr. Aspin's hospitalization following use of the less expensive vaccine is unknown. The Secretary chose to go to Georgetown Hospital instead of a military hospital in the Washington area because his personal doctor practices there, the Pentagon said.

FEVER A COMMON SIDE EFFECT

Infectious-disease specialists today raised questions about the quality of Mr. Aspin's medical treatment, particularly since a fever often follows the typhoid injection. Fevers

often cause dehydration, which is known to aggravate Mr. Aspin's heart condition, hypertrophic cardiomyopathy, a thickening of the heart muscle that can impair the heart's ability to pump blood.

"The oral vaccine's great virtue is that you get the same level of protection without the side effects," said Dr. Pierce Gardner, acting chief of infectious disease division at University Hospital in Stony Brook, L.I.

Military doctors gave Mr. Aspin several inoculations in his third-floor Pentagon office last Saturday, said Mr. Guidry, who declined to identify the doctors. Mr. Guidry said the doctors were aware of Mr. Aspin's heart condition but apparently did not anticipate his reactions to the typhoid shot.

"The bronchitis was not diagnosed," Mr. Guidry said. "The reaction to the typhoid shot was not anticipated, and therefore the cumulative effect of the two problems with the chronic, underlying heart condition was not predicted."

But doctors interviewed today said that the typhoid injection causes side effects like fever, nausea, flu-like symptoms and a sore arm in 20 percent to 30 percent of the people inoculated.

As a result, the military worked for years to help develop an oral vaccine with fewer side effects. In the mid-1980's, the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research in Washington awarded a \$782,000 grant to conduct field trials for an oral vaccine developed by the University of Maryland's Center for Vaccine Development and the Berna Products Corporation of Coral Gables, Fla., a subsidiary of the Swiss Serum and Vaccine Institute in Berne, Switzerland.

The United States Food and Drug Administration approved the oral typhoid vaccine in 1990. The Armed Forces Epidemiological Board, the Defense Department's medical advisory panel, recommended in May 1991 that military doctors give troops going overseas the oral vaccine instead of the injection.

"The Ty21a oral vaccine has been shown effective by extensive testing to be a safe and effective vaccine without eliciting the undesirable side reactions of the parenteral typhoid vaccines," according to the board's memorandum to the senior military medical officials.

In August 1991, the Army Surgeon General advised all Army medical commands to phase in the oral vaccine as existing stocks of the injection vaccine were depleted.

The oral vaccine is given in four capsules taken every other day, doctors said. The injection is a one-time shot, except for the initial immunization, which requires a booster 30 days after the first inoculation.

A Pentagon spokeswoman, Susan Hansen, said both types of typhoid vaccine were available to military commanders.

HOSPITAL ROOM AS OFFICE

Officials at the Defense personnel Support Center in Philadelphia, which buys medical supplies for military depots, said the center had 2,060 packages of vaccine shots, with 50 doses per packages, in stock and another 15,780 packages on order. The center last week ordered 6,000 packages of the oral vaccine, which have four capsules per package. Individual military bases have been ordering the oral vaccine for months, said Andreas Murai, the president of Berna Products.

A Pentagon spokesman, Bob Hall, said Mr. Aspin was expected to be released from the hospital's cardiac-care unit in "a day or so."

With secure communications equipment set up in his hospital room, Mr. Aspin took care of some pressing Pentagon business from his bed, Mr. Guidry said, meeting with

Gen. Colin L. Powell, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the designated Deputy Defense Secretary, William Perry.

While Mr. Aspin seemed in good spirits, Mr. Guidry said his voice was "gravelly" by the end of the day.

TOWARD A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

(Mr. BARLOW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BARLOW. Mr. Speaker, it is deeply gratifying that the Republicans are joining with Democratic leadership in the historic march toward a balanced budget. It is very understandable that people in our country are looking to a balanced budget amendment, because after 12 years of Republican mismanagement of our economy we are in deep trouble and we need to move quickly.

Let me just point out the deficits proposed in the last 2 years of the Bush administration: The budget sent down from the White House to Capitol Hill in 1992, \$280 billion deficit proposed by President Bush. In 1993, \$349 billion deficit proposed by President Bush.

We want to remedy the mistakes of the past.

Mr. Speaker, in the Community Development Block Grant Program, in 1981 it was the Republicans who threw out the bookkeeper, who prevented oversight by the appropriations process for the moneys sent to the States under the Community Development Block Grant Program.

Why did this happen? Why did the Republicans propose this?

(In billions of dollars)

	Budget sent to Hill by Reagan/Bush	First budget resolution reported by Senate/House conference
1981	2.2	10.2
1982	61.7	37.6
1983	107.2	103.9
1984	202.8	171.6
1985	195.2	181.2
1986	180.0	171.9
1987	143.6	142.6
1988	107.8	108.0
1989	129.5	135.3
1990	91.1	99.7
1991	63.1	64.0
1992	280.9	278.8
1993	349.9	326.6

¹ \$200 M surplus.

Note.—Budget numbers compiled by the Congressional Budget Office and the Congressional Research Service.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 265, nays 134, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

YEAS—265

Abercrombie	Gordon	Neal (NC)
Ackerman	Grandy	Oberstar
Allard	Green	Obey
Andrews (ME)	Gunderson	Oliver
Andrews (NJ)	Gutierrez	Orton
Andrews (TX)	Hall (OH)	Owens
Archer	Hall (TX)	Pallone
Bacchus (FL)	Hamburg	Parker
Baessler	Hamilton	Pastor
Barcia	Harman	Payne (NJ)
Barlow	Hastings	Payne (VA)
Barrett (WI)	Hayes	Pelosi
Becerra	Hilliard	Penny
Beilenson	Hinchey	Peterson (FL)
Bentley	Hoagland	Peterson (MN)
Bevill	Hochbrueckner	Pickett
Bilbray	Hoekstra	Pomeroy
Bishop	Hoke	Poshard
Blackwell	Holden	Price (NC)
Bliley	Hoyer	Pryce (OH)
Borski	Hughes	Rahall
Boucher	Inglis	Rangel
Brewster	Inslee	Ravenel
Brooks	Jacobs	Reed
Browder	Jefferson	Reynolds
Brown (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Richardson
Brown (OH)	Johnson (SD)	Ridge
Bryant	Johnson, E. B.	Roberts
Byrne	Johnston	Roemer
Cantwell	Kanjorski	Rose
Cardin	Kaptur	Rostenkowski
Carr	Kasich	Rowland
Castle	Kennedy	Roybal-Allard
Chapman	Kennelly	Rush
Clay	Kildee	Sabo
Clayton	Kleczka	Sanders
Clement	Klein	Sangmeister
Clinger	Klink	Sarpalio
Clyburn	Kolbe	Sawyer
Coleman	Kopetski	Saxton
Collins (IL)	Kreidler	Schenk
Collins (MI)	LaFalce	Schroeder
Condit	Lambert	Schumer
Conyers	Lancaster	Scott
Cooper	Lantos	Serrano
Coppersmith	LaRocco	Shays
Costello	Laughlin	Shepherd
Coyne	Lehman	Shuster
Cramer	Levin	Sisisky
Danner	Lewis (GA)	Skaggs
Darden	Lipinski	Skelton
de la Garza	Lloyd	Slaughter
Deal	Long	Smith (IA)
DeLauro	Lowey	Smith (NJ)
Dellums	Machtley	Smith (OR)
Derrick	Mann	Spence
Deutsch	Manzullo	Spratt
Dicks	Margolies	Stark
Dingell	Mezvinsky	Stenholm
Dixon	Markey	Stokes
Dooley	Martinez	Strickland
Durbin	Matsui	Studds
Edwards (CA)	Mazzoli	Stupak
Edwards (TX)	McCandless	Swett
Engel	McCloskey	Swift
English (AZ)	McCurdy	Synar
English (OK)	McDermott	Talent
Eshoo	McHale	Tanner
Evans	McKeon	Tauzin
Fawell	McKinney	Taylor (MS)
Fazio	McMillan	Tejeda
Fields (LA)	McNulty	Thornton
Filner	Meehan	Thurman
Fingerhut	Meek	Torres
Flake	Menendez	Torricelli
Foglietta	Mfume	Towns
Ford (MI)	Mica	Trafiac
Frank (MA)	Mineta	Unsoeld
Franks (NJ)	Minge	Valentine
Frost	Moakley	Velazquez
Furse	Mollohan	Vento
Gejdenson	Montgomery	Volkmer
Gephardt	Moran	Washington
Geren	Murtha	Waters
Glickman	Nadler	Watt
Goodlatte	Natcher	Waxman
Goodling	Neal (MA)	

Wheat
WilsonWise
WoolseyWyden
Wynn

NAYS—134

Bachus (AL)	Gilman	Myers
Baker (CA)	Gingrich	Nussle
Baker (LA)	Gonzalez	Ortiz
Ballenger	Goss	Oxley
Barrett (NE)	Grams	Packard
Bartlett	Greenwood	Paxon
Barton	Hancock	Petri
Bereuter	Hansen	Pombo
Bilirakis	Hastert	Porter
Blute	Hefley	Quinn
Boehlert	Herger	Ramstad
Boehner	Hobson	Regula
Bonilla	Horn	Rogers
Bonior	Houghton	Rohrabacher
Bunning	Huffington	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton	Hunter	Roth
Buyer	Hutchinson	Roukema
Callahan	Hyde	Royce
Calvert	Inhofe	Santorum
Camp	Istook	Schaefer
Canady	Johnson (CT)	Schiff
Coble	Johnson, Sam	Sensenbrenner
Collins (GA)	Kim	Shaw
Cox	King	Skeen
Crane	Kingston	Slattery
Crapo	Klug	Smith (MI)
Cunningham	Knollenberg	Smith (TX)
DeLay	Kyl	Snowe
Diaz-Balart	Lazio	Solomon
Dickey	Leach	Stearns
Dornan	Levy	Stump
Duncan	Lewis (CA)	Sundquist
Dunn	Lightfoot	Thomas (CA)
Emerson	Linder	Thomas (WY)
Everett	Livingston	Torkildsen
Ewing	McCollum	Upton
Fields (TX)	McCrery	Vucanovich
Fish	McHugh	Walker
Fowler	McInnis	Walsh
Franks (CT)	Meyers	Weldon
Gallely	Michel	Wolf
Gallo	Miller (FL)	Young (AK)
Gekas	Molinaro	Zeliff
Gilchrist	Moorhead	Zimmer
Gillmor	Morella	

NOT VOTING—31

Applegate	Hefner	Quillen
Army	Henry	Sharp
Bateman	Hutto	Taylor (NC)
Berman	Lewis (FL)	Tucker
Brown (CA)	Maloney	Visclosky
Combest	Manton	Whitten
DeFazio	McDade	Williams
Doolittle	Miller (CA)	Yates
Dreier	Mink	Young (FL)
Ford (TN)	Murphy	
Gibbons	Pickle	

□ 1836

So the motion to adjourn was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 25, 1993, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

948. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the 15th annual report on the administration of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1692m; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

949. A letter from the Chair, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of In-

formation Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

950. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

951. A letter from the Acting Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to section 108 of Public Law 102-229; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

952. A letter from the Acting Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to section 108 of Public Law 102-229; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

SUBSEQUENT ACTION ON A RE-
PORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY
REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

The Committee on Agriculture discharged from further consideration of H.R. 720; H.R. 720 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Ms. MOLINARI, and Mr. SOLOMON):

H.R. 1438. A bill to strengthen United States and international antiterrorism efforts; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Texas (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FROST, Mrs. MINK, and Mr. DEFazio):

H.R. 1439. A bill to create "Healthy American Schools," where children will learn the lifelong health and fitness skills vital to developing a smart body and smart mind and to empower every school with the ability to become a healthy school, built on a firm foundation of "healthy mind and healthy body" curricula; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma (for himself, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. PENNY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. MINGE, and Mr. BARLOW):

H.R. 1440. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to provide for comprehensive site-specific resource management plans on land used for the production of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERMAN:

H.R. 1441. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a cooperative agreement with the William O. Douglas Outdoor Classroom, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 1442. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish outpatient medical services for any disability of a former prisoner of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOUCHER (for himself, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. SISISKY, Mr.

BILEY, Mr. PICKETT, Mrs. BYRNE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GILLMOR, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 1443. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit to businesses which mine metallurgical coal and are required to make contributions to the UMW Combined Benefit Fund created by the Energy Policy Act of 1992; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEMENT:

H.R. 1444. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for payment of a benefit for the month of the recipient's death; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of California (for himself, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WOOLSEY, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. BLACKWELL, and Mr. LAFALCE):

H.R. 1445. A bill to provide for the trilateral negotiation of North American environmental, labor, and agricultural standards, to implement as U.S. negotiating objectives in the North American free trade area negotiations certain threshold protections regarding worker rights, agricultural standards, and environmental quality, and to implement a corresponding, comprehensive trilateral dispute resolution mechanism to investigate, adjudicate, and render binding, enforceable judgments against any unfair trade practices arising within the North American free trade area, including those involving the systematic denial or practical negation of certain threshold protections of worker rights, agricultural standards, and environmental quality; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of California (for himself, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. WALSH, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. BLACKWELL, and Mr. LAFALCE):

H.R. 1446. A bill to provide for the trilateral negotiation of Western Hemisphere environmental, labor, and agricultural standards, to implement as U.S. negotiating objectives in any free trade area negotiations pursuant to the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative certain threshold protections regarding worker rights, agricultural standards, and environmental quality, and to implement a corresponding, comprehensive multilateral dispute resolution mechanism to investigate, adjudicate, and render binding, enforceable judgment against any unfair trade practices arising within the Western Hemisphere free trade area, including those involving the systematic denial or practical negation of certain threshold protections of worker rights, agricultural standards, and environmental quality; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEMENT:

H.R. 1447. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for an improved benefit computation formula for workers who attain age 65 in or after 1982 and to whom applies the 15-year period of transition to the changes in benefit computation rules enacted in the Social Security Amendments of 1977 (and related beneficiaries) and to provide prospectively for increases in their benefits accordingly; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 1448. A bill to establish a limit on the fee which certain persons may charge for cashing checks and other instruments, to require depository institutions to cash checks issued by the United States or a State, and to provide that checks drawn by the Federal

Government may be mailed only to the personal residence or primary place of business of the payee, to a Federal post office box, or to a federally insured depository institution at which the payee holds an account; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Government Operations.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1449. A bill to prohibit any State or local government from requiring any disabled veteran to reside for a minimum period within the jurisdiction of such government as a condition of receiving benefits under any real property tax relief program of such government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALKER (for himself, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DELAY, Mr. HYDE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. PAXON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. SENBRENNER, Mr. HENRY, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HOKE, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. LINDER, Mr. BLUTE, Ms. DUNN, Mr. BAKER of California, and Mr. BARTLETT):

H.R. 1450. A bill to promote the competitiveness of American businesses by reducing the national debt to lower the cost of capital, providing tax incentives to further enhance private capital formation, modernizing antitrust law to remove barriers to cooperative enterprise, instituting civil justice reform to reduce litigious burdens, and reviewing new Federal regulations to prevent unintended effects, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Energy and Commerce, Science, Space, and Technology, Education and Labor, and Government Operations.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself and Mr. BOUCHER):

H.R. 1451. A bill to amend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 to include Montgomery, Roanoke, and Rockbridge Counties, VA, as part of the Appalachian region; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. GOODLING (for himself and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 1452. A bill to allow States, local educational agencies, and schools the flexibility to use and combine Federal, State, and local funds to improve the educational achievement of all elementary and secondary school students; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GENE GREEN (for himself, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WILSON, Mr. PETE GEREN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. BROOKS, Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. PICKLE):

H.R. 1453. A bill to provide equity in education funding for the States received under chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GUNDERSON (for himself, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. PETRI, Ms. MOLINARI, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. BEREUTER):

H.R. 1454. A bill to provide for the development of workplace readiness competencies and voluntary national industry-recognized skill standards, to promote school-to-work transition and youth apprenticeship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JACOBS (for himself and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 1455. A bill to provide protection for veal calves; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 1456. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that income of spouses will not be aggregated for purposes of the limitations of sections 401(a)(17) and 404(2) of such Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. OWENS, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MFUME, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. SLATTERY, and Mr. GONZALEZ):

H.R. 1457. A bill to protect the voting rights of homeless citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAZZOLI:

H.R. 1458. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit for the cost of installing automatic fire sprinkler systems in certain buildings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM (for himself, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mrs. ROUKEMA):

H.R. 1459. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to expand the definition of "aggravated felony," to eliminate the administrative deportation hearing and review process for aliens convicted of aggravated felonies who are not permanent residents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 1460. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of associations resulting from mergers of certain farm credit associations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MFUME:

H.R. 1461. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for stalking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. DE LUCA, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1462. A bill to amend section 203 of the National Housing Act to reduce the minimum downpayment required for a mortgage on a 1- to 4-family residence located in Alaska, Guam, Hawaii, or the Virgin Islands to be eligible for mortgage insurance under such act; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (by request):

H.R. 1463. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to implement recommendations made by the Commission on the Future Structure of Veterans Health Care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mrs. MINK, and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 1464. A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of certain factors with respect to any aspect of a surety bond transaction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ORTON:

H.R. 1465. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the treat-

ment of certain real estate activities under the limitations on losses from passive activities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1466. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to improve the procedure for appointing members to the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey:

H.R. 1467. A bill to provide grants to community-based organizations to provide employment and job training services, to provide grants to those organizations to provide attitudinal, motivational, and skills training to certain disadvantaged youths and adults, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. PELOSI:

H.R. 1468. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to convey for scrapping by the National Maritime Museum Association not more than two vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet that are scheduled to be scrapped; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Ms. PELOSI (for herself and Mr. MILLER of California):

H.R. 1469. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to use the facilities of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area to develop and implement a program to use drought-resistant species of plants in the landscaping of public lands; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 1470. A bill to reauthorize the Mining and Mineral Resources Research Institute Act of 1984; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 1471. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating a segment of the Rio Grande in New Mexico as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. SYMANS):

H.R. 1472. A bill to make unlawful the transfer or possession of assault weapons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 1473. A bill to correct the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States as it applies to electric toothbrushes and parts thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 1474. A bill to increase the irrigable acreage for the San Angelo Federal reclamation project, TX, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SUNDQUIST:

H.R. 1475. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the unified estate and gift tax credits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VALENTINE (for himself, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. TANNER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BATEMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. APPLE-

GATE, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. MINGE, Mr. HASTERT, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. SCHAEFER, and Mr. LEHMAN):

H.R. 1476. A bill to require the President to submit to the Congress each year an integrated jus-

tification for U.S. foreign assistance programs, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Agriculture, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and Rules.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 1477. A bill to provide for the management of lands and recreational resources at Canyon Ferry Recreation Area, MT, and other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself and Mr. ROWLAND):

H.J. Res. 162. Joint resolution to designate July 5, 1993, through July 12, 1993, as "National Awareness Week for Life-Saving Techniques"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HEFNER:

H.J. Res. 163. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States restoring the right of Americans to pray in public institutions, including public school graduation ceremonies and athletic events; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SHEPHERD:

H.J. Res. 164. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide a limitation on the terms of U.S. Senators and Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. PETE GEREN, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. WILSON, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FROST, and Mr. HAYES of Louisiana):

H. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to certain international aviation agreements and certain agreements between commercial air carriers of the United States and the United Kingdom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol grounds for the 12th annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. GILCHREST (for himself, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. CRANE, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. EWING, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. HERGER, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. WELDON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. KLUG, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. KASICH, Mr. REGULA, Mr. KYL, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. SAXTON, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CANADY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. DORNAN, and Mr. GALLEGLY):

H. Res. 139. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require a three-fifths vote to adopt any rule reported from the Committee on Rules disallowing germane amendments to a bill or resolution; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

60. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to a bipartisan Pacific Northwest forest summit; to the Committee on Agriculture.

61. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Utah, relative to Federal grazing fees; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

62. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Utah, relative to a balanced Federal budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

63. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of New Mexico, relative to veterans benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

64. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Utah, relative to a medical care savings account; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

65. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Iowa, relative to small issue private activity bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina introduced a bill (H.R. 1478) for the relief of Chi Hsi Tsui, Jim Mie Tsui, Yim Whee Tsui, Yin Tan Tsui, and Yin Chao Tsui; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 18: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. MANTON, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 25: Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LAROCO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. TORRES, Mr. REED, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 28: Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 59: Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. DEAL, and Mr. KNOLLENBERG.

H.R. 65: Mr. HUTTO, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 67: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 71: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.

H.R. 94: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 112: Mr. DOOLITTLE and Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 159: Mr. ISTOOK.

H.R. 162: Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. BATEMAN, Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, Mr. FISH, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. MCDADE, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 163: Mr. ALLARD.

H.R. 171: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 174: Mr. VENTO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 214: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ZIMMER, and Mr. BARCIA.

H.R. 303: Mr. DICKS and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 322: Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 335: Mr. BLUTE, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 349: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, and Mr. BAKER of California.

H.R. 406: Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 454: Mr. MEHAN.

H.R. 455: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 465: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia.

H.R. 485: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. TALENT, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr.

CLAY, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 535: Mr. BROOKS, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PAS-TOR, Mr. REED, Mr. REGULA, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. WISE, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. KOLBE, Ms. FURSE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. BE-VILL, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. ORTON.

H.R. 624: Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BUYER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. LAZIO, Ms. DANNER, Ms. FURSE, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. LEVY, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. HOKE, and Mr. ROE-MER.

H.R. 653: Mr. KINGSTON, and Mrs. THURMAN.
H.R. 656: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 672: Mr. CLAY, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 697: Ms. BYRNE, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana.

H.R. 723: Mr. PORTER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BOEHNER, and Mr. LEVY.

H.R. 749: Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, and Mr. TEJEDA.

H.R. 767: Mr. CRAPO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. LAROCO, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming.

H.R. 776: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 786: Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 792: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 830: Mr. BAKER of California, Ms. FOWLER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. TALENT, Ms. LAMBERT, Mr. CRANE, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SUNDQUIST, and Mr. COX.

H.R. 852: Mr. McKEON, Mr. KIM, and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 882: Mr. HEFLEY and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 886: Mr. LEVY, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. LAZIO.

H.R. 915: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. MCINNIS.

H.R. 916: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SABO, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. HASTINGS, and Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 930: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. HYDE, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 942: Mr. COBLE, Mr. WILSON, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. COYNE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. WALSH, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. COLEMAN, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. PORTER, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 943: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. LEVY, and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 960: Mr. BARLOW, Mr. ROGERS, and Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 962: Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. FISH, Ms. FOWLER, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. DEAL, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 985: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Ms. DANNER, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. BAKER of California, and Mr. KASICH.

H.R. 986: Miss COLLINS of Michigan.

H.R. 999: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GOSS, Mr. HILLIARD, and Mr. ZIMMER.
 H.R. 1036: Mr. REED, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. PENNY.
 H.R. 1048: Mr. JACOBS.
 H.R. 1055: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. KING, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. FROST, and Mr. ZELIFF.
 H.R. 1067: Mr. GINGRICH and Mr. COX.
 H.R. 1079: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of TEXAS.
 H.R. 1086: Mr. MACHTELEY.
 H.R. 1088: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. EWING, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. ARMEY, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.
 H.R. 1090: Mr. EWING and Mr. SANGMEISTER.
 H.R. 1133: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BRYANT, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. VENTO, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. COYNE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BEILSON, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. HINCHY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MFUME, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. SARPALIUS, and Mrs. LLOYD.
 H.R. 1141: Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. KLUG, and Mr. KYL.
 H.R. 1149: Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 1164: Mr. SCHUMER.
 H.R. 1200: Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, and Mr. LANTOS.
 H.R. 1210: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
 H.R. 1247: Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BAKER of California, and Mr. HOKE.
 H.R. 1280: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, and Mr. BORSKI.
 H.R. 1285: Mr. PENNY, Mr. BAKER of California, Mrs. LLOYD, and Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.
 H.R. 1309: Mr. FAWELL, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. PENNY.
 H.R. 1322: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. HOKE.
 H.R. 1327: Mrs. MEEK, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MONTGOMERY, and Mr. HASTINGS.
 H.R. 1332: Mr. BOEHNER, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DIXON, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GOSS, Mr. HEFNER, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MCDADE, Mrs. MINK, Mr. OXLEY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mr. ZIMMER.
 H.R. 1360: Mr. FLAKE, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Ms. WATERS.
 H.R. 1368: Mr. SHAYS.
 H.R. 1404: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. KING, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. FISH, and Mr. LANCASTER.
 H.R. 1405: Mr. RUSH, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BERREUTER, and Mr. KOPETSKI.
 H.R. 1415: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, and Mr. TUCKER.
 H.R. 1424: Mr. DEFazio.
 H.J. Res. 1: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HINCHY, and Mr. KREIDLER.
 H.J. Res. 9: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
 H.J. Res. 22: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia and Mr. EVERETT.
 H.J. Res. 30: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.J. Res. 79: Ms. DANNER, Mr. FROST, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. WALSH.
 H.J. Res. 80: Mr. APPELGATE, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BREWSTER, Ms. DANNER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SHARP, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.J. Res. 83: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas and Mr. MARTINEZ.
 H.J. Res. 86: Mr. PETRI, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. SOLOMON.
 H.J. Res. 88: Ms. FURSE.
 H.J. Res. 94: Mr. PARKER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BERREUTER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SWIFT, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. INHOFE, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois.
 H.J. Res. 108: Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. FISH, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. THOMAS of California, Ms. DUNN, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. JEFFERSON.
 H.J. Res. 111: Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. QUILLEN, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. SABO, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. RAVENEL.
 H.J. Res. 126: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FROST, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. LEVY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MACHTELEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SWETT, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. WOLF.
 H.J. Res. 127: Mr. WOLF, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BERREUTER, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. FROST, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SHARP, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mr. MENENDEZ.
 H.J. Res. 133: Mr. HAMILTON, Ms. DANNER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. BARCIA.
 H.J. Res. 147: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. KASICH, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. FROST, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. ROSE, Mr. MOORHEAD, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. MCCREY, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. HUTCHINSON.
 H. Con. Res. 2: Mr. STUMP.
 H. Con. Res. 6: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. TALENT, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, and Mr. BARCIA.
 H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.
 H. Con. Res. 29: Mr. UPTON.

H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. PARKER, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, and Mr. BROWDER.
 H. Con. Res. 56: Mr. WATT, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. TORRES, Mr. RICHARDSON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. DE LA GARZA, and Mr. DE LUGO.
 H. Res. 38: Ms. SNOWE, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. ANDREWS of Texas.
 H. Res. 53: Mr. NUSSLE.
 H. Res. 86: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. GALLO, Mr. KIM, Mr. KING, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. TORKILDSEN, and Mr. TUCKER.
 H. Res. 118: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, and Mr. MANZULLO.
 H. Res. 122: Mr. LEVY, Ms. MOLINARI, Ms. DANNER, Mr. QUINN, Mr. TALENT, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. BLUTE, and Mr. TOWNS.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1430

By Mr. SOLOMON:

—At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE II.—LEGISLATIVE LINE-ITEM VETO ACT OF 1993

SECTION 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "The Legislative Line-Item Veto Act of 1993".

SEC. 202. LEGISLATIVE LINE-ITEM VETO RESCISSION AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the provisions of part B of title X of The Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, and subject to the provisions of this section, the President may rescind all or part of any discretionary budget authority for fiscal years 1994 and 1995 which is subject to the terms of this Act if the President—

(1) determines that—

(A) such rescission would help balance the Federal budget, reduce the Federal budget deficit, or reduce the public debt;

(B) such rescission will not impair any essential Government functions;

(C) such rescission will not harm the national interest; and

(D) such rescission will directly contribute to the purpose of this Act of limiting discretionary spending in fiscal years 1994 or 1995, as the case may be; and

(2) notifies the Congress of such rescission by a special message not later than 20 calendar days (not including Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays) after the date of enactment of a regular or supplemental appropriations act for fiscal year 1994 or 1995 or a joint resolution making continuing appropriations providing such budget authority for fiscal year 1994 or 1995, as the case may be.

The President shall submit a separate rescission message for each appropriations bill under this paragraph.

SEC. 203. RESCISSION EFFECTIVE UNLESS DISAPPROVED.

(a) Any amount of budget authority rescinded under this Act as set forth in a special message by the President shall be deemed canceled unless during the period described in subsection (b), a rescission dis-

bill making available all of the amount rescinded is enacted into law.

(b) The period referred to in subsection (a) is—

(1) a congressional review period of 20 calendar days of session during which Congress must complete action on the rescission disapproval bill and present such bill to the President for approval or disapproval;

(2) after the period provided in paragraph (1), an additional 10 days (not including Sundays) during which the President may exercise his authority to sign or veto the rescission disapproval bill; and

(3) if the President vetoes the rescission disapproval bill during the period provided in paragraph (2), an additional 5 calendar days of session after the date of the veto.

(c) If a special message is transmitted by the President under this Act and the last session of the Congress adjourns sine die before the expiration of the period described in subsection (b), the rescission shall not take effect. The message shall be deemed to have been retransmitted on the first day of the succeeding Congress and the review period referred to in subsection (b) (with respect to such message) shall run beginning after such first day.

SEC. 204. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act—

(a) the term "rescission disapproval bill" means a bill or joint resolution which only disapproves a rescission of discretionary budget authority for fiscal year 1994 or 1995, in whole, rescinded in a special message transmitted by the President under this Act; and

(b) the term "calendar days of session" shall mean only those days on which both Houses of Congress are in session.

SEC. 205. CONGRESSIONAL CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATIVE LINE ITEM VETO RESCISSIONS.

(a) **PRESIDENTIAL SPECIAL MESSAGE.**—Whenever the President rescinds any budget authority as provided in this Act, the Presi-

dent shall transmit to both Houses of Congress a special message specifying—

(1) the amount of budget authority rescinded;

(2) any account, department, or establishment of the Government to which such budget authority is available for obligation, and the specific project or governmental functions involved;

(3) the reasons and justifications for the determination to rescind budget authority pursuant to this Act;

(4) to the maximum extent practicable, the estimated fiscal, economic, and budgetary effect of the rescission; and

(5) all actions, circumstances, and considerations relating to or bearing upon the rescission and the decision to effect the rescission, and to the maximum extent practicable, the estimated effect of the rescission upon the objects, purposes, and programs for which the budget authority is provided.

(b) TRANSMISSION OF MESSAGES OF HOUSE AND SENATE.—

(1) Each special message transmitted under this Act shall be transmitted to the House of Representative and the Senate on the same day, and shall be delivered to the Clerk of the House of Representatives if the House is not in session, and to the Secretary of the Senate if the Senate is not in session. Each special message so transmitted shall be referred to the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate. Each such message shall be printed as a document of each House.

(2) Any special message transmitted under this Act shall be printed in the first issue of the Federal Register published after such transmittal.

(c) **REFERRAL OF RESCISSION DISAPPROVAL BILLS.**—Any rescission disapproval bill introduced with respect to a special message shall be referred to the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives or the Senate, as the case may be.

(d) CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

(1) Any rescission disapproval bill received in the Senate from the House shall be considered in the Senate pursuant to the provisions of this Act.

(2) Debate in the Senate on any rescission disapproval bill and debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours. The time shall be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader of their designees.

(3) Debate in the Senate on any debatable motions or appeal in connection with such bill shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by the mover and the manager of the bill, except that in the event the manager of the bill is in favor of any such motion or appeal, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or his designee. Such leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any debatable motion or appeal.

(4) A motion to further limit debate is not debatable. A motion to recommit (except a motion to recommit with instructions to report back within a specified number of days not to exceed 1, not counting any day on which the Senate is not in session) is not in order.

(e) POINTS OF ORDER.—

(1) It shall not be in order in the Senate or the House of Representatives to consider any rescission disapproval bill that relates to any matter other than the rescission budget authority transmitted by the President under this Act.

(2) It shall not be in order in the Senate or the House of Representatives to consider any amendment to a rescission disapproval bill.

(3) Paragraphs (1) and (2) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by a vote of three-fifths of the members duly chosen and sworn.